This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

600086322R

PRESENT-DAY PAPERS. FOURTH AND FIFTH SERIES.

By the late FREDERIC MYERS, M.A.,

PERPETUAL CURATE OF ST. JOHN'S, KESWICK.

Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d. each.

I.

Catholic Thoughts on the Church of Christ and the Church of England.

Extract from a Letter written by the late Dean Alford, and published in his Memoirs:—

"Have you ever seen 'Catholic Thoughts,' by the late Mr. Myers, of Keswick, two privately printed volumes, one on the Church of Christ and the Church of England, one on the Bible and Theology? Very remarkable, especially as written 1834—1848, containing the largest views now urged by any of us, put out by a devout Christian Churchman."

"It seems unaccountable that a book containing so much powerful and suggestive thought on the ecclesiastical questions that have been agitating England for more than forty years should have been so long withheld from publication."—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

II.

Catholic Thoughts on the Bible and Theology.

"It is a matter of difficulty with the present writer to express adequately his appreciation of the worth and genuine originality of the teaching of Mr. Myers on the great questions of the constitution and function of the Bible—of the New Testament in particular—without seeming to employ the language of mere indiscriminating eulogy. For it is his deliberate opinion that we do not yet possess in our insular literature any work which can be regarded as either occupying the same ground, or as worthy to be the substitute for that now lying before us."—*Spectator.*

DALDY, ISBISTER, & CO., 56, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

600086322R

CHRIST AND THE PEOPLE

CHRIST AND THE PEOPLE

SERMONS

CHIEFLY ON THE OBLIGATIONS OF THE CHURCH
TO THE STATE AND TO HUMANITY

BY THOMAS HANCOCK

LATE CURATE OF ST. STEPHEN'S, LEWISHAM; AUTHOR OF "THE PECULIUM, AN ESSAY ON THE CAUSES OF THE DECLINE OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS."

LONDON
DALDY, ISBISTER, & CO.
56, LUDGATE HILL
1875

100. g. 427.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY VIRTUE AND CO.,
CITY ROAD.

CONTENTS.

I.

JESUS CHRIST THE IRRESISTIBLE ATTRACTOR OF THE PEOPLE.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, JUNE 13, 1869.

"Then drew near unto Him all the publicans and sinners for to hear Him. And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them."—ST. LUKE xv. 1, 2.

The three classes in Christ's congregation—(1.) *Strange change in the class of Christ's disciples—Pastoral visitation, or physical labour, the current substitute for the doctrine of Christ*—(2.) *The pastoral gathering of men to God begins with God—The modern model pastor anticipated by the Pharisees*—(3.) *God and the people already united in Christ*—(4.) *Sacerdotal and evangelical aspects of the ministry—Christ always bears true witness to His relation to the people in the Sacrament*—(5.) *The State, in our time, more faithful to Christ than the Church—Like doctrine, like flock—Congregations of young ladies—Christ a statesman and politician: He speaks to the English clergy through English artisans—Political and social views of the workman usually more christian than those of the ordinary clergyman.*—PAGES 1-19.

II.

THE ELECTION AND THE "MISSION."

SEPTUAGESIMA SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1874.

"So the last shall be first, and the first last; for many be called, but few chosen."—ST. MATTHEW XX. 16.

The first and the last—(1.) *St. Stephen and St. Paul—Many called, but few chosen, an evangelical sentence—The culture of the entirety of Humanity is the work to which God calls men—God's chosen are those who do that for Humanity which His called ones have left undone—The agricultural labourers*—(2.) *Concurrence of the election and the mission—The Church's existence is the Church's proper mission—Quality, not quantity, of work demanded by God—The eleventh hour in history—By*

the election God calls His clergy to be national—The Church was not founded by Christ to hold a brief for vested interests, nor to be a sub-section of a Tory party—The union of Church and State rests upon the common origin of each in God, and not upon the establishment and endowment of some of the clergy of the former by the latter—Clerical Hudibrases.—PAGES 20-33.

III.

MAN'S CITIZENSHIP AT ONCE ON EARTH AND IN HEAVEN.

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, NOVEMBER 15, 1868.

"Our conversation is in heaven."—PHILIPPIANS iii. 20.

St. Paul free, though in prison—(1.) *The National Apostle a citizen of Rome and Jerusalem—Cities and bishops—Our Nation is our city—An unenfranchised man not yet a citizen—Christian idea of the City underlying the revolutions of the Latin nations—Nativity and nationality kindred words*—(2.) *Baptism God's witness to men that they have an abiding city—The heavenly city not the rival but the parent of earthly cities*—(3.) *Attempts to realise a perfect order on earth—Names of earthly order attributed to the eternal order*—(4.) *The Trinity in Unity the archetypal City—Heaven not far off—Wordsworth—The eternal is always present*—(5.) *The Apostle's paradoxes—Heaven belongs to Humanity—Every righteous man has had a glimpse of the perfect state—Baptism bears witness to us that the State is divine, the religious world not divine—Our lust for an Elysian fairyland not the same as the longing of the saints for a perfect and eternal order*—(5.) *Heaven and modern English politics—National citizenship has issued out of the heavenly—The three foes of citizenship in St. Paul's age, Cæsarism, Phariseeism, Christian Ultramontanism—St. Paul's apostolic life a struggle for Nationality against Ultramontanism.*—PAGES 34-55.

IV.

GOD SENDS HIS PROPHETS TO REBUKE THE CHURCH RATHER THAN THE WORLD.

OCTOBER 1, 1872.

"Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt, saying, You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities. Can two walk together, except they be agreed?"—AMOS iii. 1-3.

God is never without prophets—(1.) *Prophets differ from apostles—False prophets claim to be apostles also—Mohammedanism, Anabaptism, Mormonism, Romanism—Jesus Christ sent to the nation of Israel*—(2.) *The Church, clergy and laity, God's abiding teacher and apostle to nations—Sins of the Church worse than sins of the world—God's prophets always bear witness against the Church—No railer at the modern State is a prophet of God—The State is not "the world"—Godly and godless national education*—(3.) *The pulpit, not the school, the priest's place as a teacher of the nation.*—PAGES 56-68.

V.

THE WITNESS OF THE CREATION TO THE PROMISE OF THE SON OF MAN'S APPEARING.

ADVENT SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1874.

"Where is the promise of His coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation."—2 ST. PETER iii. 4.

Common aim of Epistles of St. Jude and 2 St. Peter—(1.) *Scoffers in the Church—The formal unbeliever not the worst scoffer—Christ not wanted in Salonica lest He should dethrone Mammon*—(2.) *Christ's appearance, once taken to be a promise to Humanity, now used as a threat against Humanity—Will the Last Day be the advent of the Devil or the Redeemer?*—(3.) *The unvarying continuity of the universe—An uncreated "creation"—Humanity's speech has become Christian—The continuity of the creation shews Law; it is continuous through Duty—Duty the first thought of the Advent season—Has the spiritual creation any duty?—History and biography are the records of the struggle of Lust and Duty in humanity—Stones and men as creatures under Law*—(4.) *The advent of Christ not a melodrama—Judgment is a restitution of order—The material creation implies the final regularity of the spiritual creation—Science sees a promise in creation—The Eucharist is the Lord's assurance that man's utmost expectations for Humanity are to be justified—God's judgment is always for us as well as against us—To face the Son of Man hereafter we must enter into fellowship with Humanity here.*—PAGES 69-90.

VI.

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT, DECEMBER 6, 1868.

"We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts."—2 ST. PETER i. 19.

The Transfiguration and the second Advent—(1.) *The Old Testament or Jewish Bible—Concord of the Apostle of the Circumcision and the Apostle of all Nations—"The Bible only" originally a Judaizing cry*—(2.) *The Old Testament and the New—The Old Testament and the Church*—(3.) *The Church uniting both Testaments made the Bible of Humanity—The Bible as the work of the Church—The written word and the eternal Word*—(4.) *Making a religion from the Bible—A man's own religion is not Bible-religion—Tradition and the Bible are not rivals—Right and wrong traditions—Traditions of* 1662; *do they belong to the Independents, the Presbyterians, or the Unitarians?—Each sect bears witness to a better tradition than that of which it boasts—Congregationalism; the National Church has laymen, but no laity—Presbyterianism; the National Church has priests, but no presbytery—Liberal Christianity; Christ's disciples ought to be thinkers, not slaves—Bible-reading and Church-manufacturing—The Church always in need of the Bible—*

(5.) *The Bible and the Sacraments—Baptism and the Eucharist anterior to the New Testament—The Sacraments the abiding test of doctrine—The mischief done by preachers in the pulpit corrected by the Head of the Church at the font and the altar—the Bible and books of devotion.*—PAGES 91-115.

VII.

THE SON OF MAN REVEALING HIMSELF TO HIS CHURCH AS A THIEF.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT, DECEMBER 20, 1874.

"And this know, that if the good man of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. Be ye therefore ready also; for the Son of Man cometh at an hour when ye think not. Then Peter said unto Him, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even to all?"—ST. LUKE xii. 39—41.

Waiting, the attitude of the Church—(1.) *The Son of Man coming like a thief—A thief is a son of man—Education of the humanity buried under the thiefhood, is the work of Christ's Church—Where this is left undone, the Son of Man comes to punish the clergy*—(2.) *Revolutions viewed from two sides: as the work of the wicked; as the judgment of God—Robbing the Owner of Humanity—Christ regarded as a thief by the religious world of His Nation*—(3.) *In what household will the Son of Man appear as a housebreaker? in the Church, in the Nation—Christ's short parables of His Advent—His Advent always at hand—The two fundamental divisions in Churches and Nations; the humane and the inhuman*—(4.) *Christ's appeal to the crowds—The inspiration of common sense—Signs to the senses and signs to the spirit—The increase of schools a sign of national watchfulness for the Lord's appearance—The clergy may be further from the Son of Man than the people—The questions which stir the two clerical parties are neither national nor human—The continuity of the National Church; old clothes, or the Eternal Spirit?—Historical revelations of the Son of Man as a thief—Mohammedanism—The French Revolution—Christ must visit all His own households.*—PAGES 116-138.

VIII.

THE PRESENTATION OF THE FIRST-BORN, A LAW FOR THE ENGLISH AS WELL AS FOR THE JEWS.

FEAST OF THE PURIFICATION, FEBRUARY 2, 1873.

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Sanctify unto me all the first-born, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast; it is Mine."—EXODUS xiii. 1, 2.

The feast of the meeting—(1.) *Jesus a King and a citizen—Relation of the king to the nation in English history—God's Law and national laws—Laws cease; the Law abides*—(2.) *The Virgin and St. Joseph not Catholic first, citizens afterwards—Separation of the Church and the State in our opinions—"Not two Christs, but*

one Christ"—The revealed fact of the childhood of Jesus, His obedience to laws—The Head of the Church obeyed secular law and State law—The Purification not an archaic observance; it bears on modern national life—(3.) *God the source of English law—Secular authority may be more godly than ecclesiastical authority—Deterioration of national priesthood—Laymen must bear part of the blame.*—PAGES 139-155.

IX.

BLESSING PERSECUTORS: ST. PAUL'S CHARGE TO THE CHURCH OF ROME.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY, JANUARY 19, 1873.

"Bless them which persecute you: bless, and curse not." ROMANS xii. 14.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans a letter to the Church of Rome—(1.) *The same Church still existing—The Roman Church was and is a Church, not the Church—St. Paul did not write to the Pope—The Church greater than the Bishop—The Roman Bishops subjects, by God's providence, of the Roman State—Greek Cæsars, German Cæsars, the Italian king—The totality of Roman Christians, not the internationalist cardinals, the real Church of Rome—Ancient pre-eminence of the Roman Church; its faith, its obedience, its persecution—The Catholic Church is a fellowship of national Churches—A Roman Catholic Church and a Roman Catholic empire—Baptism is republican—Persecution by the rulers of the Roman Church; its Bishop the greatest curser in Christendom—St. Paul's letter the earliest document in the Roman controversy; ought to be the first studied*—(2.) *No fundamental difference between Roman Christians and other Christians—The progress of God's kingdom in the modern States has stayed persecution—Pleasant persecutions—Conversion from a sect to the Church useless unless it is a conversion from sectarianism to churchliness—Children as persecutors—St. Paul's charge is a hard saying—Blessing and eulogy—Peter Martyr—Archbishop Cranmer—Cranmer canonized by the Christian people or real Church—Our Lord's blessing upon His persecutors—St. Stephen's mind and St. Stephen's Church.*—PAGES 156-172.

X.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED; THE MANIFESTATION OF GOD IN SAVING THE LEPER AND THE CENTURION.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY, JANUARY 26, 1873.

Jesus "said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."—ST. MATTHEW viii. 10-12.

The Athanasian Creed and the Church of England—Chillingworth the first objector—(1.) *The familiar words and phrases of the first three verses of the Creed—Opponents and defendants take it for granted that their meaning need not be*

inquired into—Similarity of the Gospel for the day to the Creed—Salvation the subject of the Creed and the Gospel—(2.) *Is there One whose business it is to save? —A will to be saved the common characteristic of the Leper and the Centurion —Each knows what he means by salvation*—(3.) *"The Catholic faith" not the same as the opinions of the "Catholic party"—Worship before salvation—The Saviour owns the Catholic faith of the unbeliever—Who is the "whosoever" of the Creed? —The Creed demands morality and not notions—Antinomians and Arians—The Creed sends Humanity to men seeking the Absolute Good—It tells who is the Good, and why worthy of the utmost trust of men, whether lepers, pagans, or heretics—Does not say anywhere, 'whosoever does not accept Trinitarian opinions will be damned'—The Creed is the Church's evangelical answer to all who are in the Leper's and Centurion's condition.*—PAGES 173-187.

XI.

FELLOWSHIP WITH CHRIST IN HIS SUFFERINGS IS NOT TO BE SOUGHT IN OUR FEELINGS, BUT IN FELLOWSHIP WITH HUMANITY.

PASSION SUNDAY, APRIL 3, 1870.

"Who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself."—HEBREWS ix. 14.

Christ's Passion an action: how our sufferings differ from His—(1.) *The passion of Judas synchronizes with the Passion of Christ—Christ offered Himself—The Church is called to think more of His Passion than of its details—Not feeling for Him, but doing like Him, is fellowship with His suffering*—(2.) *Christ suffered as The Man, not merely as a man—Passion-sermons should liberate the conscience, not persecute it—The unchristian lust of well-to-do Christians to feel miserable— The Passion is a part of the Good News and the Creed—Contemplation of it is idle unless it quickens our hope for Humanity—Study of its details may hide its universal significance—Christ died as the Knight of Humanity as well as the Revelation of God—Chlodwig and the Passion—Christ's crucifiers had the clearest conception of physical details—To take the hated side of "flesh and blood," and not of "interests," is our present method of having fellowship with Christ in His Passion.*—PAGES 188-205.

XII.

EVERY-DAY MORALITY AND THE THEOLOGY OF THE DAYS OF CHRIST'S PASSION.

PALM SUNDAY, APRIL 5, 1868.

"In lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God."—PHILIPPIANS ii. 3-6.

St. Paul says his Creed—(1.) *Charity towards those near us demanded for them by the Church before the Easter Communion—Antagonism of selfishness and the*

Church—The Sacraments imply that selfishness is the foe of Church-life—(2.) *What we call unselfishness subsists eternally in God—The Incarnation and Passion of His Word God's self-discovery to Humanity of His unselfish mind*—(3.) *The Creed would prove useful if men would use it; the chain which binds the common acts of men to the mind of God—The Creed not commended by extraordinary acts, but by ordinary life—Growth in common morality the end of celebrating the Passion*—(4.) *Virtue is grace—New Secularism is old Calvinism without its theological clothes—A wife-beater, but "a good Churchman"—The hypocrite is one who separates virtue and grace—The mind of God, shewn in Christ's Passion, is seeking entry into us to make us moral.*—PAGES 206-220.

XIII.

VICTORY OVER THE WORLD.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

"Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."—1 ST. JOHN v. 4.

Christ's Resurrection a sign to men that Humanity's foes are beaten—(1.) *Jesus a conqueror of the world—The Apostles conquered by the world—The antichristian World is not Humanity: it is not the Nation: it abuses each, and uses them—Worldly men and spiritual men*—(2.) *Hope born again in the apostles at the sight of Christ Risen—They saw not merely the actual, but the necessary Conqueror—Not only Christ, not only our faith, but whatsoever is born of God has the pledge of victory over the world—Livingstone's funeral—Gamaliel and St. John shared the same conviction—The Pharisee a sceptic; the fisherman sent to Humanity a believer.*—PAGES 221-233.

XIV.

HUMANITY AND THE CHURCH.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER, MAY 8, 1870.

"Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul; having your conversation honest among the Gentiles: that, whereas they speak against you as evil-doers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation."—1 ST. PETER ii. 11, 12.

St. Peter not a leader of a Church party—He claimed no Papal jurisdiction as Church ruler—Authority in a society the gift of the whole society—Twofold relation of the Church to Humanity—Christians are God's first fruits, men His harvest—(1.) *The Church united with Humanity—Christ the Head of the Church because the Head of every man—Do we become Christians to save our own souls?*—(2.) *The Church separated from Humanity to be God's witness to facts and relations which would be equally real if the Church did not exist—Christians as strangers and pilgrims—A good Churchman is a good man—Those without the Church have divine claims upon the Church—A pseudo-Peter the forlorn hope of those whom*

God puts down from their seat—The Church must not be a religious club, but live for all nations and every creature—A nation grows in Godliness when it grows in Humanity—An ungodly nation shews more favour to men as Churchmen than to men as men—The "first Pope" preached the outpouring of God's Spirit upon "all flesh."—PAGES 234-251.

XV.

CHRIST'S ASCENSION AND UTILITY: THE THINGS ABOVE ARE THE THINGS NEEDED ON THE EARTH.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION, MAY 25, 1873.

"Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth." COLOSSIANS iii. 2.

St. Paul's counsel contradicted—(1.) *The Secularist need not be a worldly man; the anti-Secularist may be—What St. Paul meant by "Set your affection," and by "above"*—(2.) *We learn what the things above are by learning what He is Whose concern they are—The Son of Man's business must be the business of Humanity—He loves the earth He leaves—An accepted Head of Humanity is God's sign to men what they are—Inhuman things are the things on earth upon which men should not set their affections*—(3.) *The Ascension of Christ a doctrine of utility; it reminds Humanity of duty, that which is due from men as men—Death of John Stuart Mill. He set his affections on the things above: worldly religionists set their affections on things on the earth—Does the ideal of the just Secularist subsist? is it meant to be realized?—The ascension of the second Adam is God's justification of the highest hopes and anticipations of those who through the Church's faithlessness think or fear that He has not ascended.*—PAGES 252-270.

XVI.

PRAYER TO THE FATHER IN THE SON'S NAME.

ROGATION SUNDAY, MAY 22, 1870.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, He will give it you."—ST. JOHN xvi. 23.

Daring test offered to Humanity by its Head, Jesus Christ—The place of Christ's promise in the civilization of men—(1.) *The extent of prayer: what shall we ask?—The order of prayer: what did Christ's Apostles ask?—The limitation of prayer: what the absolutely Good will not give*—(2.) *The receivers of Christ's promise—The Apostles as the Catholic Church, as Christians, as men—No Council is universal unless every Christian is represented in it—Restoration of the Lord's congregation needed*—(3.) *The Eucharist and Common Prayer co-instituted at the first Lord's Table—Prayer is asking*—(4.) *Prayer the witness and expression of Humanity's relation to God: as a family to the father—All children address the Lord's Prayer to their fathers*—(5.) *Prayer in the Son's name—All prayers which God answers are asked in the Son of Man's name—The custom of the Church—Syllables will not change selfish mendicancy into Christian prayer—In prayer we lay hold of the fact of our unity—"The Better Observance of Ascension Day"—Rogation-tide a witness that God and Humanity are not divided——Rogations are prayers in Christ's name for good upon this earth.*—PAGES 271-290.

XVII.

THE FELLOWSHIP IN GOD THE SOURCE OF HUMANITY'S FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD.

TRINITY SUNDAY, MAY 23, 1869.

"For through Him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." EPHESIANS ii. 18.

St. Augustine's pregnant text—The heathen ruler and philosopher seeking access to God—Yet God's image must lie in the heathen—(1.) *St. Paul's assertion a bold one: God has access to men*—(2.) *St. John saw a door open in heaven—Humanity is shewn a Man: but He is the Man, and the access for all men to God—The Son leads to the Father—The Supreme Unity and Perfect Fellowship—Man most godly when most human*—(3.) *God unknown unless known as the Father—The Arian or Mahommedan who cries, "Abba, Father," must believe with the heart in the Triune Fellowship*—(4.) *The Holy Ghost and the Christian consciousness—The filial Spirit—The Church-creating Spirit—Christ's Spirit uniting and ruling men—The unity of the Church and unity of Humanity—Caricatures of Catholic unity—The Spirit the author of liberating and humanizing movements as well as the author of unity—A Trinity Sunday a fitter completion of the Church's festival order than a Corpus Christi.*—PAGES 291-309.

XVIII.

PROPERTY AND RESPECTABILITY: OR THE IDOLS WHICH ENGLISHMEN ARE TEMPTED TO WORSHIP INSTEAD OF THE TRINITY IN UNITY.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, JUNE 2, 1872.

"Little children, keep yourselves from idols."—1 ST. JOHN v. 21.

Transition in the Church season after Trinity Sunday from theology to morals—Our morality to be Christian or theological—The apostolic preacher of morality tells men what God is—Idolatry and immorality—(1.) *The Apostle only concerned with the idols of Christians—Have English Christians no idols?—Middle-class idols—Idols not necessarily evil in themselves—Property and respectability—The parable of Lazarus and the rich man*—(2.) *The worship of property; religious tone of its idolaters—Its idolatry violates the human fellowship—The Centre of that fellowship the only absolute Proprietor*—(3.) *The worship of respectability—A rival set up to "our Father"—Religious tone of this worship—Religious novels are class-stories, not human stories—The Church must cast away her own idols—Idolatry the forerunner of humiliation.*—PAGES 310-322.

XIX.

THE EXCUSES WHICH CHRISTIANS OFFER TO GOD FOR NOT ENTERING INTO FELLOWSHIP WITH HIM AND HUMANITY.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, JUNE 9, 1872.

"A certain man made a great supper, and bade many: and sent his servant at supper time to say to them that were bidden, Come; for

all things are now ready. And they all with one consent began to make excuse."—ST. LUKE xiv. 16-18.

Two parables of a supper—The present possibly a development of the earlier—(1.) *Some think that God has made for Humanity a great fire, not a great supper—Supper-time a time of rest and fellowship—God invites the Church to fellowship with Him and Humanity, to which she is already pledged*—(2.) *The excuses made by Churchmen for refraining from fellowship with Humanity—Selfish lust for heaven, Church-going, and love for our own souls may be keeping back Christians from God's Feast—The Church is made for Humanity.*—PAGES 323-335.

XX.

THE FALSE FELLOWSHIPS TO WHICH THE RELIGIOUS WORLD INVITES THE MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSAL FELLOWSHIP.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, JUNE 16, 1872.

"All of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility." 1 ST. PETER v. 5.

Retrospect—(1.) *Fellowship with Humanity the lesson for the Church in the Eucharistic Epistle and Gospel—The Epistle speaks of the Man who is God's fellow—The Gospel shews Him seeking fellowship with the outcasts and entirety of mankind*—(2.) *Fellowship with a sect self-separated from Humanity a caricature of Church-fellowship—Not self-conscious piety, but real humanity (at one with God in Christ) the foundation of the Catholic Church—The head of a universal human Church must be the permanent foe of sects—Fundamental illiberality of false catholicity*—(3.) *The foundation of "The Christian Evidence Society"—"The Spread of Infidelity"—An infidel Christian the worst infidel—Infidelity outside the Church is to be met by fidelity within—"Infidels" are men, and therefore related to the Church in universal human fellowship—The infidelity which the Pharisees do not care to assail—The priest of Jesus Christ ought to seek fellowship with the publicans rather than with the Pharisees—The Church is God's witness that many whom the sects call infidels are really Christian—Proselytism of as many as possible the business of sects—Fellowship with Humanity the business of the Church—God's fellowship with all nations and every creature is the mystery of the Gospel.*—PAGES 336-352.

XXI.

THE COMPASSION OF MANKIND A SIGN OF THE COMPASSION OF MANKIND'S HEAD AND LORD.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

"And much people of the city was with her. And when the Lord saw her, He had compassion on her."—ST. LUKE vii. 12, 13.

The two compassions of which the bereaved woman was the subject—Jesus and the community: their contrast and their affinity—(1.) *The compassion of God disclosed in Jesus Christ's visit to Nain—The Son of God present at every funeral*—(2.) *Jesus is The Man—The Unitarian and the Marian know Him as a Man—*

"the Heart of Jesus" to be found in Humanity—Pilgrimage of the conscience to Nain better than pilgrimage of the body to Paray-le-Monial—Exterior and interior Humanity—God's Son and God's Spirit—(3.) *The Son of God and Son of Man the universal Lord—Humanity and Omnipotence co-existing in the Word—God's Son comes to meet the troubled, not because they are good, but because they are human.*—PAGES 353-362.

XXII.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH IS TO BE KEPT, NOT TO BE MADE.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, OCTOBER 4, 1868.

"Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit."—EPHESIANS iv. 3.

The unity of the Church an article of Christian belief—(1.) *Unity is a fact to be realized by faith, not a condition to be made—The Corinthian Church was one, though divided by Church parties*—(2.) *Attempts to make the Church one—Constanz, Trent, the Gallican unity of the seventeenth century—Practical denials that the Church has unity—The Holy Spirit always giving evidence of the existing unity of the Church—Luther and Loyola were both Christians*—(3.) *The wedding feast as a parable of unity—A feast is not festal to the unsocial and selfish—The founders of sects despair of the Church—Unity of a family still a fact, though each kinsman may lose his grasp of it—Unity rests upon necessity or the will of God*—(4.) *Every Christian bound to endeavour to keep the unity—The Spanish Armada an attempt to make unity—The Papacy, like all sects and parties, bases unity upon concord in opinion, not upon the one foundation laid by God.*—PAGES 363-380.

XXIII.

THE JUDGMENT OF PARTIES, FEAR TO ASK QUESTIONS OF THE TRUTH.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, OCTOBER 12, 1873.

"Neither durst any man from that day forth ask Him any more questions."—ST. MATTHEW xxii. 46.

Every "crisis" is a day of judgment—(1.) *Questioning, the right way of approaching the truth—Jesus Christ questioned by the Jewish parties, by the Apostles—His answers are His judgments*—(2.) *The truth must be questioned truthfully—all truthfulness is implicit obedience to Jesus Christ—Unity separated from truth a hollow idol—Organization becomes anti-Christian when separated from truth—Jesus Christ both the Truth and the Organizer.*—PAGES 381-394.

XXIV.

FAITH IN GOD MANIFESTED BY NEIGHBOURLY KINDNESS.

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, OCTOBER 11, 1874.

"Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee."—ST. MATTHEW ix. 2.

The congregation assembled in the house at Capernaum—Religious occupation interrupted by human need—The sick man and the doctor of divinity—(1.) *Jesus takes his congregation by surprise—The sinner surprised to find that the Saviour knows*

him and his condition—(2.) *The surprise of the Church—The evangelists say nothing of the sick sinner's faith, but only of his sickness or humanity—Not our own faith, but the Son of God, in our Saviour—The healing of the sick man God's vindication of the faith of His neighbours—Prayer for others may be unchristian—Unity of mind with mankind's Liberator from sickness and sin the best way to the help of the miserable.*—PAGES 395-407.

XXV.

THE HATRED OF OUR KINDRED AND OUR OWN SOULS DEMANDED FROM US BY JESUS CHRIST.

OCTOBER 20 AND 27, 1872.

"If any man come to Me, and hate not his father and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own (life) soul also, he cannot be My disciple."—ST. LUKE xiv. 26.

The parable of the excuses—The servants of property and respectability refusing God's invitation to the universal fellowship, the "residuum" of the people accepting it—(1.) *The Saviour of the human world disliked by the religious world, but followed by the common mass of humanity—Jesus Christ bids each follower to count the cost of discipleship—The parables of the builder, the king, the salt—Arithmetical religion—Safety and salvation*—(2.) *The religious world omits the climax of the Lord's demand—Ought not men to love their own souls above all else?—Men break God's commandments in order to secure safety for their own souls—Hatred of his own soul demanded by the Head of Humanity from every man—not the Pope's test for canonization, but the second Adam's test for humanity*—(3.) *The multitude is not casuistical, and so understands Jesus Christ—Every conscience hears its Lord's demand: How it is heard by the layman—Does God help those who help themselves, or those who help Him?—The old peasant in Faust—How the Lord's demand is heard by the clergyman: preferment, or the following of the Son of Man?—The Head of the Church may call us to hate our fathers in God as well as the father of our flesh—Luther recognized this call; so became a great builder, victorious king, and salt with savour—The sects and the Romish vice-Christ urge men not to hate their own souls—Faber's perversion an act of fundamental unbelief—The Apostle of the Nations a hater of his own soul—No salvation of the soul till it is freed from its self-seeking lust for safety.*—PAGES 408-429.

XXVI.

THE HATRED OF THE WORLD TO THE CHURCH.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, JUNE 14, 1873.

"Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you. We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren."—1 ST. JOHN iii. 13, 14.

"The world" used as a nickname—What the Pope and the Plymouth Brethren mean by the world—(1.) *St. John shews us by contrast what the world is which hates the Church—God is the apostolic starting-point in his definition—The Father and the*

world the final opposites—This world is not Humanity, or the world of God's making—The Church and the world are opposites, because the Church bears witness to the universal Father—The world enters into and possesses the Church when the Church ceases to bear witness to the common brotherhood of men—Priests sending working women to prison: they violate the law of their priesthood—The Catholic Church means the Church of humanity—A "Catholic party" is a Protestant sect in germ—(2.) *"The world" as a weapon of party warfare—Are all men the brethren of Churchmen?—The court of Louis XIV. heard pious sermons against the world, but denied that Frenchmen were the brethren of French churchmen.*—PAGES 430-440.

XXVII.

THE ELEVATION OF THE CROSS.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1873.

"And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts."—GALATIANS v. 24.

The two black-letter festivals of the Cross in the Anglican kalendar—(1.) *The victory of Constantine; the victory of Heraclius: the Church once saw in each new hope for humanity—The Church of England nobly impatient of legends—Reality the first demand for a national worship—The I AM and the nation*—(2.) *St. Paul says the Church has crucified the flesh: whom did he mean by the Church?—Not an aggregate of self-called "converted" persons—St. Paul before his conversion was what the religious world calls a "converted man;" after it, he was a man—The Galatian Christians not converted persons in the modern sectarian sense*—(3.) *They were simply baptized persons—Baptism the apostolic starting-point, the one fact in Christian life which abides always true—The Cross elevated in nations, in persons—Baptism does not sunder us from Humanity, but tells us what Humanity is—Luther and the elevation of the Cross.*—PAGES 441-453.

XXVIII.

SCIENCE AND THEOLOGY.

NOVEMBER 17, 1872.

"I and My Father are one. Then the Jews took up stones again to stone Him. Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewn you from My Father; for which of those works do ye stone Me? The Jews answered Him, saying, For a good work we stone Thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God."—ST. JOHN x. 30-33.

Religion set up against theology—Jesus Christ as viewed by the religionist and seen by the theologian—One of God's discoverers, or God's Son?—The attack of theologians upon science precedes the attack of scientists upon theology—Theology the only science of which the Bible treats—Jesus Christ not the founder of a religion, but the centre of theology—Professor Owen urges the clergy to save religion by sacrificing theology—The Bible does not give us a religion, but tells us of God—Theology the foundation of religion—Had Jesus Christ sacrificed theology to religion, He would not have been crucified, nor have founded a Christendom.—PAGES 454-468.

I.

JESUS CHRIST THE IRRESISTIBLE ATTRACTOR OF THE PEOPLE.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, JUNE 13, 1869.

ST. LUKE XV. 1, 2.

"Then drew near unto Him all the publicans and sinners for to hear Him. And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them."

THE parables which compose this chapter were spoken in the hearing of three classes of persons. It is necessary to recollect this original audience throughout our interpretation of any one of these parables. The text is St. Luke's preface to the whole series. In it two of these classes are mentioned; the presence of the third is implied.

These parables were spoken (1) to publicans and sinners,—to raise them up, to console them, to encourage them to repentance, to recall them to God, to recall them to Humanity. They were spoken (2) to pharisees and scribes,—to correct their false notions about the relation of sinners to God. They were spoken also (3) to the disciples,—for their own en-

lightenment and for their guidance in dealing with those who are without the Church, and with the unworthy who are within.

I.

The most wonderful thing told us by this text is not that Jesus invites sinners to Him, but that to Him they have already come uninvited. "Then drew near unto Him all the publicans and sinners for to hear Him." No one in this church, I believe, doubts that Jesus Christ (the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever) is still teaching. Everyone sees that there are as many publicans and sinners in England as ever there were in Palestine. You, my brethren, cannot be expected to enter into the shame and misery which often overflow the heart of the priest of Jesus Christ as he goes into the pulpit and glances at the faces and the habits of those seated before him. A well-dressed, respectable, decent crowd fills the nave of every full church from the east to the west. I see that the class of persons whom Jesus Christ drew, draws, and ever will draw perforce to Himself—whenever and wherever He is known to be speaking—are not here; and I do not believe that, as a class, they are in any church in England.

They are not absent because they are uninvited. Everything has been tried to bring them. At no time since the beginning of Christendom have been seen such efforts, such earnestness, such a yearning

anxiety to draw the masses of people to Jesus Christ in His Church as may be seen in our day. The persons who do come to church, but do not wish to have the church to themselves, are ready each with an expedient, a crotchet, a theory, a new mechanism. Most of them say—what bishops and archdeacons say in their charges—'Try more, more active, more wise, more loving pastoral visitation.' God forbid that I should depreciate what is a very important part of the Church's action: but I must say that this very age of the people's alienation from the Church is above everything the age of pastoral visitation. Do the persons visited think that it is Jesus Christ, the Liberator and the Light of mankind, Who has visited them in the priest, or in the sister, or in the district visitor? If you could follow Jesus in His Church's servants, and ask the English poor who it is that has just left their door, most of them would say, "The gentleman who preaches at such and such a church," "The lady who gives tickets for coal or meat." To say, as some do, that the poor and the artisans will not come because, if they do, they will find closed pews and crowds of better-dressed people, is to go off on a false issue. Some great difficulties, no doubt, lay between Jesus Christ and the publicans and sinners of the first age; yet to Him they went, spite of all hindrances. They went because He was Jesus, and because of the *kind* of teaching He was giving. Of nothing ought I to be more certain than of this, that if I ever so feebly repro-

duced His teaching, according to my own time and my own countrymen, every aisle and vacant space in this church would be uncomfortably crowded with the unclean, the ragged, the careless, the vulgar, the wicked—"all the publicans and sinners." For it was not *some* of them—good specimens of a bad class, but it was the class, as a class, which came. "Then drew near," says the Holy Gospel, "*all* the publicans and sinners." If this were to happen here and now, I believe that the second verse would as certainly follow the first verse in the nineteenth century as it did in the first. "The pharisees and scribes" (whoever they may now be) would murmur "saying, This Man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." My brethren, what shuffling, what shrinking, what indignant complaining there would be in the majority of parish churches. We should hear it said, 'Respectability, decency, morality, and old-fashioned piety have been turned out of church. The Lord's priest has become a revolutionary charlatan. The Lord's assembly looks like a chartist meeting!'

My brethren, I assure you that I wish to preach "a practical sermon." I have heard the respectable persons who do come to church say in many a parish, "We want *practical* sermons." Yes, that is their demand. But what do they mostly mean by practical sermons? Do they mean sermons for themselves—private, not catholic? Do they mean personal application of the Gospel to the making comfortable of the individual, not the great wide

Gospel for the whole Humankind? We may now and then, perhaps, say something to suit this publican, something to relieve that sinner. Jesus preached something so wide and so full that it drew to Him "*all* the publicans and sinners." The New Adam is the most practical of all Teachers because He is the most universal.

II.

The movement towards the Saviour in the wonderful episode of the gospel history which includes the relating of the three glorious parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Lost Prodigal Son, apparently begins with the lost ones themselves. It does not seem to begin with the Seeker of the lost. Here the sheep gather round the Shepherd; the lost coin shews itself to the Seeker; the prodigal children run to Him Who is the proof that God is their Father. The Gospel does not say, Then Jesus drew near to the publicans and sinners to preach to them, but "Then drew near unto Jesus all the publicans and sinners for to hear Him."

Holy Scripture is always thus taking us by surprise, overturning our theories of the right and the fit. The universal Pastor of souls, according to this Holy Gospel, did not use much of what is now in many places called pastoral activity. He did not in any great measure visit the houses, the bodies, the external life of the souls He came

to gather into His flock. Of that kind of pastoral visitation the Saviour declared that the sinners and publicans had already more than enough from the scribes and pharisees. "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte." If we could but read the reports of the old pharisaic missionary agencies, we might possibly find in their language a curious anticipation of our own. It is true that He says, in the first of the three parables of this chapter, that when He has lost one sheep, He at once leaves His ninety-nine, and goes after that one which is lost until He finds it. But to know what the Shepherd's going is, and what the Shepherd's seeking is, we must return to the cause and origin of this very parable. St. Luke represents the respectable church-goers, the decent old-fashioned piety and respectability of Jewry, as scandalized at the crowds of common scoundrels and outcasts who have gathered about the Saviour. If He is a prophet indeed, He ought to know what class of persons these are who flock so thickly about Him, and knowing what they are, He ought to drive them away. But He actually encourages them; so badly off is the Son of Man for any support of His claims amongst the decent classes, He even eats with the riff-raff. "The Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." Then He, to meet the objection of the religious world, to explain the flocking of the masses to Him, "spake this parable unto them"—the parable of the shepherd going in search of the one lost

sheep when he had ninety-nine sound sheep in the fold.

Our blessed Lord, by the form of this parable, grants the truth of the objection of the religious world. 'Yes, you decent and outwardly pious classes, these classes who have drawn near to Me to feed on My doctrine are sinners and slaves. They come to Me because they recognise in Me the Saviour and Liberator. They are lost sheep; they are content to yield to the grasp of My arms, because they perceive Me to be the good Shepherd. They are hungry and starving; they draw near to Me because they see that I am the food of souls, the bread of life. They visit Me because I have first visited them; they love Me because I have first loved them; they draw near to Me because I have first drawn near to them.'

III.

Our blessed Lord thus shews us to-day in our Gospel that although the movement of us sinners to Him, and the relationship betwixt Him and ourselves, may seem to begin with us, although we may seem first to draw near to Him, yet our approach to Him is the result of His approach to us. "I bring near my righteousness," says the eternal God by the prophet. The righteousness of God is now revealed in His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ; and it is the Incarnation of His Son—His thorough self-identification

with the whole human race, His complete mediation of God and us in Himself—which is the cause of any of us men drawing near to Him. The apostle calls Him Who is the righteousness of God "our righteousness." In sinners because they are *men*, because they are sharers of the universal Manhood which is one with the Godhead in Jesus Christ, there is a hunger and thirst for righteousness, that is, in christian language, for Christ; and as the hungry run to food, and the parched with thirst are drawn to the water, so are sinners drawn by an omnipotent necessity to Jesus Christ. However parched and consumed a man may be by sin, there will be at least some time in each man's life when the visitation of God will teach him that His righteousness is the meat and drink he needs; there are times when every man must hunger and thirst for the food of spirits. A madman may refuse to eat and drink what is set before him, but his *nature* as a man will protest against his madness. The Saviour Jesus has already drawn near by His Incarnation in our universal flesh to every sinner upon earth. This or that man may refuse, you and I may refuse, to draw near to Him; but there will remain in our new nature as men an unconscious hunger and thirst for Jesus Christ, a craving for Him which His Spirit has inspired, which will protest against our refusal. It is with us as with young Samuel in the lesson this evening. God speaks to us, God calls us, God teaches us within. We are conscious of some call;

conscience tells us that we ought to obey it. But we do not know either by conscience or by anything in our experience Who this Caller is. We may say, in some way of our own, as the Jews said to Moses, "What is His name?" We do not know that "it is the Lord." God has given to mankind the outward social representative of His Son, the leader to Himself, the teacher of the truth as it is in Jesus, in the mystical body of His Son—the catholic Church. When little Samuel runs to Eli the priest, the priest tells him that the Word which has spoken to him is the Word of the Lord. The priest of Israel thus anticipated the office given by Jesus to His clergy of all Nations, "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me."

As the enlightening Word of God drew near to Samuel, though Samuel did not know Him, so He is drawing near to all human creatures, to men as well as to children. The Word is nigh them, the apostle tells the Nations, even in their mouth and in their hearts; but they do not know who He is, nor all that He is to them, until He is preached to them by the word of His Church. Samuel mistook the voice of the Word for Eli's voice. He did not know it to be the voice of the God of Abraham, the King of Israel, the Judge and Restorer of the Nation, the Reformer of the Church, Who was visiting him to ordain him as the restorer of the nation to faith, as its liberator from the Philistines and from its idols, and as the reconstructor of the shattered State. So, my brethren, the mass of publicans and sinners—not only in heathendom, but

in Christendom—confusedly call the Voice and Spirit of God, Who speaks in "all flesh" through the Word made flesh, by many changing names—conscience, their better nature, reason, the moral sense, the inward monitor. We cannot understand what God Himself says within us until we have seen the Perfect Revelation of God as He is in Jesus Christ without us. "Whom ye ignorantly worship," said the apostle to the most acute and introspective of peoples, "Him declare I unto you." The gospel is not the news of a new God: it is the Self-revelation of the real character, real nature, real Name (the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost), real relation to us, of that one and only God in whom as men we are already confusedly believing that we live and move and have our being.

IV.

The Holy Gospel implies that the drawing near of sinners to Jesus Christ, their God and Saviour—in Jewry, in heathendom, in Christendom—depends upon some true sight of Jesus by them, upon the revelation of Jesus to them as He is. "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." The work of drawing men to Jesus is only in part our work. The hardest part of it is not left to the Church. He Himself has reserved it for Himself; He is such to mankind, He is so much to each sinner, that He will draw them; sinners cannot but be drawn to

Him, if they see Him as He is. Is there not proof enough in thousands of biographies, written and unwritten, that the force with which the sick flies to the physician, the thirsty to the water, the heated to the cool shadow, the tired and heavy laden to their rest, is feeble compared to that divine force of which these are parables and symbols—the force with which all sinners, when they see Him as the Saviour, fly to Jesus Christ? If we, then, who are ordained to be the lifters-up of Jesus Christ before men—both by the preached Word and by the Sacraments—misrepresent Him, or if we half represent Him, some sinners may draw near to hear Him, but "*all* the publicans and sinners" will not draw near. For the endless comfort of souls, for the protection of His Church, for the perpetual self-correction of His clergy, God has instituted the *Sacraments:* in these it is impossible for us to misrepresent or half represent His Son our Saviour. Not only Baptism and the Eucharist, but Absolution, Confirmation, and Ordination are something in themselves by God's gift; they are not conditioned by our "views" of them, nor by anything we teach or leave untaught about them. What they once were they always are; they are what they are by the grace of God in themselves, independently of anything we can say about them. However feeble and unfaithful the ministration of doctrine has been in the Church in different ages or nations, God Himself has preserved the catholic doctrine and Himself taught it by the ministration of the Sacraments. If the New Cove-

nant had contained nothing but a preaching ministry it would have lost its gladdening and liberating character: because it has contained a sacerdotal ministry our faults and follies as teachers have been unable to destroy or hide its abiding evangelical character.

But we must recollect that for the conquest of the nations to Jesus Christ, for the bringing of all the publicans and sinners to the Sacraments, He has given us the weapon of the *Word*. "Christ sent me not to baptize," said the Apostle of the Nations, "but to preach the gospel." We see in to-day's Gospel "all the publicans and sinners" drawing near to Jesus, not to be fed by Him as at other times, but to *hear* Him.* There was a hunger and thirst for the whole doctrine of Jesus Christ in the eternal nature of these men keener than the keenest hunger and thirst of their temporal nature. It was *the doctrine* of Jesus the Pastor of pastors which brought such a flock of sheep about him. There must therefore have been something in it which "all publicans and sinners" felt that they needed; there must have been something in it which was already more or less occupying their better thoughts; it must have answered to questions which they asked themselves; it could not have seemed wholly

* Et quia sinistrâ intentione possent appropinquare, subdit, *ut audirent Verbum Dei*. Patet ergo quia non solum corpore, sed etiam mente ad eum appropinquabant, &c. (*Radulphus Ardens*, Hom. ix., part ii., Dom. 3 post Trinitatem, pp. 1976, 1977. Ed. Migne. It is interesting to notice that the Church of Aquitaine in the eleventh century named the Sundays "after Trinity" according to the English use, and not "after Pentecost."

foreign to their hopes and efforts as Jewish citizens, or to the thoughts which mainly occupied them when they were busy at their trades, at their pleasures, or doing their duty as fathers and sons, friends and rivals, employers and servants. His doctrine must have corresponded strangely to the thoughts that visited them when they were alone; it must have replied in quite another fashion than the scribes and the pharisees replied to the world-wide questions of each individual man,—'What am I? Whence have I come? Why am I? What will be my end? Shall I have any end?' The Wisdom who could answer all these questions, the Living Bread and Wine who could satisfy all this hunger and this thirst, had no need to go on any external search for publicans and sinners. The fact that they could not but come to Him was the sign that He had already invisibly gone in search for all these sinners, and had found them in their hearts and consciences, in the very centre of their being. They could not keep away from Him. Because He shewed them Himself, or rather His Father and their God in Himself, their Humanity in Himself, therefore the creatures gathered irresistibly to their God, the sinners to their Saviour, the men to the Son of Man, in Jesus the speaker of the Parables of the Gospel. His flock was what it was because His doctrine was what it was. "All the publicans and sinners drew near to hear Him" because His doctrine was the doctrine publicans and sinners were needing. It was the doctrine they had

been and still were seeking in vain from scribes and pharisees, from sadducees, from wealth, from the successive rebels and mob-leaders and false christs of their nation, from pleasures, from society, even from sin.

V.

When the mind of Jesus Christ had entered less fully into the law of the State than it has entered in our age, the State took up the sword which God had put into its hands for other ends, and used it to compel all the publicans and sinners to go to Jesus Christ in His Church. It was "Church or Prison," "Church or Inquisition," as even now it often is "Church or Social Ban,"—or in its positive formula, "Church and Respectability." The publicans and sinners of the European nations went possibly to Jesus; they heard something about Him; they did not understand Him; they did not "hear Him" when they heard about Him; they were as much the better for church-going as Doeg the Edomite, that liar and murderer, was the better for being "detained before the Lord." But now the State, submitting its laws more and more to God's great unwritten law, has repented of its old ungodly method of making men godly. The bishop who pretends to be Christ's sole vicar has lately cursed the modern State on account of its growth in godliness and its obedience to the unseen King of Nations. For the State now treats men as God

Himself is treating them, as creatures of a free will; it leaves free play to the conscience, the reason, the heart. If, therefore, the publicans and sinners throng to Jesus in this age and in the future ages it must be solely, as it was in the first age, from that miraculous and irresistible attraction which is ever flowing forth from Jesus Christ Himself; it must be because His Truth, as uttered by His Church, is meeting all the proper demands of their intellect, their conscience, and their heart.

The new conditions of the political relation of the State to the Church increase the responsibility both of the priests and people of the Church. The State, confessing itself not to be the minister of God's truth, but to be the minister of justice between man and man, now throws the whole burden of hearing or refusing to hear Jesus Christ upon the publicans and sinners themselves. It throws the burden of representing Jesus as He is to the publicans and sinners upon His own elect and ordained representative, the Church. The State or Nation will neither be a tyrant over publicans and sinners nor a slave under scribes and pharisees. There was never, therefore, I say, so great a weight lying upon the clergy as ministers of the Word as there is in our time. Jesus Christ in Himself is the irresistible loadstone of all sinners and outcasts. "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." From Him and His whole doctrine—if they see Him and hear it as the publicans and sinners in the holy Gospel saw and heard—they *cannot* keep

themselves away. Therefore we ought to be every hour studying Jesus Himself, and studying the life, the thoughts, the habits, the beliefs, the urgent wants, the loud demands of those whom He is seeking. What our doctrine is our flock will be. If our doctrine is like Christ's, our flock will be like His. If we really desire our flock to be like His in the holy Gospel, if we wish publicans and sinners to draw near to Him speaking by us, then we must not be afraid to speak as He spake. Manly doctrine will draw a manly flock. Womanish doctrine will draw a flock of women. How often the priest, turning to the congregation on a week-day to say "Dearly beloved brethren," sees nothing but sisters! Cowardly or time-serving doctrine can only gather a flock which will be of no use to the Son of Man or to mankind. The doctrine of Jesus, "in Whom are all things," can alone gather together the catholic flock of all sorts and conditions of men; no other doctrine can draw to His Church "all the publicans and sinners" of our own nation and age.

If we indeed desire that all English "publicans and sinners" may be drawn to Jesus speaking to-day in His English Church, we must begin to examine our word and doctrine; we must ask ourselves, Do we preach the doctrine of the Son of Man in the nineteenth century as He and His apostles preached it in the first? Our primary want is not any greater mechanical power, any extent of liberty of worship, any increase of material aids. The strength of the Church

has been placed by God in that Humanity to which the Church is sent, and in that divinely created need to draw near unto Jesus Christ which is already present in every soul for whom He was made man, was crucified, rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, sent forth His Spirit, and created His Church. Men drew near to Him because by His eternal Love and Wisdom, by His universal Humanity, by His all-probing study and appropriation of their condition, He had first drawn near to them, and had entered fully into all the longings, thoughts, hopes, demands, and sufferings which filled their lives. "We trusted that it had been He who should have redeemed Israel"—our Nation. This was the secret of the irresistible attraction which drew crowds of Israelite publicans and Israelite sinners to the Saviour.

The present way to the intellect, the conscience, and the heart of the great mass of the English people lies, I believe, through political and social truth and equity. The spirit of the Son of Man speaking to the Church through the artisans and the labourers of our time asks for justice, for rights. We ask Him to be content with alms and charities. The mighty works of God in our own time are hidden from us, or we blasphemously call them the works of Beelzebub, because we forget that the Spirit of truth and of unity is also the Spirit of liberty and right. The greatest preacher whom the French Church has enjoyed in our time came through a bitter process to this discovery: but he was not free to make

the full evangelical use of his discovery, because of the bondage in which his Church was and is held to the will of its extra-national and anti-national ruler in Rome. "We complain," says Lacordaire, "of the scepticism which is biting into the heart of the working classes. It is in the power of the Church, if she has faith and courage, to remove it. But what use is made of the Church in the emancipation of the present and the future? Absolutely none. I had myself grown old in nine years of unbelief when I heard the voice of God calling me to Himself. I have reached Catholic faith through social faith. I have been led back to religion by means of politics. The farther I advance, the more natural, however, does this seem to me."

We clergy of the English Church enjoy a freedom which was out of the reach of the eloquent priest of our subject sister Church, for we have no external and anti-national master to demand that we shall care first for him, and only secondly for Christ's flock in our Nation. But have our minds in their national liberty yet ascended so high and extended so broadly as the mind of Lacordaire in his ultramontanist prison? I do not shrink from saying that in the ordinary politics and the social doctrine of the thinking mass of the English artisans I see something which is already far more Christian, far more Catholic, a far more faithful reflection of the mind and law of the crucified and risen King of the Nation, and far more at one with the doctrine which we ourselves are teaching in the

Church by the ministration of the all-levelling and all-exalting Sacraments, than I discern in the political and social doctrines of the majority of the English priests of Jesus Christ. Do we not still hold and preach as christian (if not in our pulpits, at least in our activity as citizens) a doctrine concerning the State or Nation which is utterly infidel? Until we clergy are ourselves converted, until we have cast the religious and social murmuring of the scribes and pharisees out of our language in the pulpit and in our contact with Englishmen as fellow-citizens, we may multiply our pastoral visitations, we may throw open freely all our churches, we may perfect our machinery (which will only be machinery when it is perfect), we may tease and worry or even drive in some refined mode the publicans and sinners to come and hear Jesus Christ; we may petition the State to close public-houses and keep museums and gardens closed so that they may go to no more attractive rivals; but still, to Jesus Christ speaking by us (so far as He does speak by us) "all the publicans and sinners" will not draw near. For though they may hear some whisper of His word in what we preach, they will lose it or misunderstand it beneath the thundering sound of our own words.

II.

THE ELECTION AND THE "MISSION."

SEPTUAGESIMA SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1874.

ST. MATTHEW XX. 16.

"So the last shall be first, and the first last; for many be called, but few chosen."

THE parable of the workers in the vineyard, which forms the Church's Holy Gospel for Septuagesima, may be said to be hemmed in by this text. If you look at the place which this parable holds in St. Matthew's Gospel, you will see that it takes its start out of the last words of the Lord's charge to the twelve men He had first called to work in His vineyard. "But many that are first," said the Lord, "shall be last; and the last shall be first."

These words end the nineteenth chapter; the twentieth chapter opens with this parable. But there is no natural break in the connection: the parable holds its place in St. Matthew's Gospel as a continuation of the Lord's charge. It is an illustration and a development of those words to His first workers which we considered last Sunday. You will see that

the Lord ends the parable and gathers up its moral by repeating the sentence out of which it had its beginning: "*So* the last shall be first, and the first last."

I.

Last Sunday these words came before us as the close of the Church's Holy Gospel for the feast of St. Paul's Conversion. We saw that the twelve apostles were called early in the morning of the day of the Church's history to work in the culture of the Humankind as God's and for God. They were promised their wages. They were not to grumble, if men later called—as a Stephen and a Paul—should receive from the common caller the same reward. We saw how thoroughly these words apply to the wonderful labourer who was called at the eleventh hour out of the religious world into God's world-wide human vineyard, whose equal apostolical title and reward was grudged to him by many of those who were earlier at work for the God of all. To-day, however, as we hear the Lord repeat this saying, we notice that He repeats it with a new clause. He says again, The last workers shall be first, and the first workers shall be last. But now He adds a reason: "*For* many be called, but few chosen."

I need scarcely do more than remind you in passing of the bitter and utterly anti-evangelical meaning which has been forced out of the Lord's sentence by those who have first torn it away from the parable

with which He has for ever united it. Putting asunder what the Son of God has joined, savage preachers have dared thus to paraphrase, or rather to parody His hopeful words: "Many are reprobate, but few elect; many shall harden themselves, but few be converted; many shall be damned, but few saved; Humanity shall go to hell, but a clique of disagreeable pharisees shall get to heaven." This interpretation is such a blasphemy of God our Father's name, which we pray may be hallowed, it is such a limitation of His kingdom which we pray may come, that it seems to me as if the mere mention of it in the Church at this hour of history is sufficient refutation of it.

It must surely be clear to all who read this saying of the Lord as the logical and reasonable moral of His parable (as the Church plainly reads it by refusing to separate them in the eucharistic Gospel), that the call of which the moral of the parable speaks must be the call of which parable itself has spoken. What other call could it mean than the call which the apostles had received in their boats and at their different businesses? What other call can it now mean than the call which the Lord of human life now addresses to every Christian after his degree? It must be the call of a Christian to a Christian's proper work. It must be the call of a man to man's proper work. What is this work? The parable tells us that it is the culture of God's vineyard. It is the culture of that universal Humanity in ourselves and in

our neighbours which Jesus, our new Adam, is uniting with God. The entirety of this Humanity God has claimed as His own by the incarnation and sacrifice of His Son. Every man of this Humanity God is now claiming inwardly by His Spirit and outwardly by a catholic or universal-human Church, as His own.

The choice or election also of which Jesus speaks in the moral of His parable, must be that choice or election which He had exhibited in the parable itself. We must therefore go back to the parable if we wish to see in what sense the Master of human life is calling many, but is choosing few. We see that *all* the labourers, whom the Master finds idle in the market, are in time "called" to work, *all* in their hour are "chosen" to work. At the ending of the day, the market-place has been emptied by the Lord's call, the vineyard has been filled. Who then are the "few" and the "chosen" in the parable? Those who were called at the eleventh hour. The few were plainly those omitted in the earlier calls. The *few* were those at whom the *majority* grumbled.

The Lord of human life has His "chosen" in those "few" who are called at the eleventh hour of personal life, at the eleventh hour in the history of societies and nations. That which is really distinctive of such workers in any vineyard of the Lord, is not (as the privileged earlier workers grudgingly complain) that they are given liberty and fraternity and equality with them, or that they

inherit an equal reward although they work an unequal time. It is that they are "chosen" by the Lord to complete the work which the others are not completing. Think how Humanity uses its Lord's phrase of "the eleventh hour" in all its serious business. Men do not so much apply this phrase to a quantity as to a certain *quality* of time. The eleventh hour is the last hour but one: it is carrying us toward the last hour. It is the critical epoch. On the use of it, the success or defeat of some serious movement or purpose is depending.

At the eleventh hour the Lord of life, Who is the source and ruler of all history, sees that His divine purpose is not done. His vineyard has indeed within it many workers. Happy men and fortunate classes have possessed for a long historical day noble opportunities; they have had the great vocations of life in Church and State quickly opened to them. Some, like ancient aristocracies, have been entrusted with the culture of Humanity from early in the morning of that history which is God's day; some, like the great plutocracies, from the sixth hour of God's day; others, like the middle classes, from the ninth hour of the history of peoples. Yet the Lord sees that His glorious work of universal human culture is not done. God looks upon His dear vineyard of Humanity and sees the moral degradation of millions, the unredeemed slaves, the ignorant who are perishing for lack of knowledge, the despairing suicides, the total absence

of any possible hope in life for whole classes of men and women, the waste of noble faculties in low drudgery, the horrible rule of the incompetent and the mediocre. At the eleventh hour the Lord determines in His grace that His work shall no longer be bungled at, that some solid portion of it at least shall be perfected and completed. The Lord God, Who chooses the weak to do His strong work, Who uses things that are not to bring to nought things that are,—goes again into the market-place. God descends amongst the dregs of society, amongst those whom we call the enemies of society, that He may fetch forth real saviours and cultivators of society.

It is in those standing idle in the market-place, capable of splendid work, but whom no man has hired, or is likely to hire, that the Lord God has His divine reserve. "The last shall be first." They will do, they alone can do, what the fortunate possessors of elder privileges have failed to do. Their predecessors in God's vineyard will at first despise them, and afterwards suspect and grudge at them, as they see them take a place and do a work in that vineyard of God which they have so long been regarding as their own vineyard. "The first shall be last." But God, out of His care and goodness for His vineyard, which is the entirety of His Humankind, has chosen others and will bring them within as fellow-workers. The Lord goes into the market-place, and enfranchises a whole remainder of the Humankind:

He frees them from their forced idleness and want of work in His holy human order: He sets free the magnificent but chained faculties with which they are endowed. The Gentile idolater serves the God of the elect Jew; the serf takes his stand as Christian brother beside the lord: the tradesman takes a human place beside the noble—the poor preacher beside the beneficed bishop or rector; the artisan becomes the fellow-workman of the great scholar. In our own day and land have we not seen the Lord of the vineyard go into the market-place and even call the agricultural labourer of England to become a citizen and a man? "The last" will do the latest part, the completing part which is often the hardest part, the noblest part, the first part in spiritual order of the divine work. The "chosen" of whom the moral of the parable speaks, are plainly those who are chosen at the last particular hour, at the critical hour of churches and nations. They have to do, and they will do, that last particular work which would have remained for ever undone, if the gracious will of God had not gone forth enfranchising new men and new classes, loosing them from their bonds, and fitting them for fulness of service.

II.

In the parable, as you will perhaps have noticed, our blessed Lord joins together two thoughts which are for the hour joined in our part of His

English church and nation. We read of a sending, and we read of a choosing; or, if we latinize the words, we read of God's *mission* of men into His vineyard, of God's *election* of men to work for His vineyard. Some who do not yet deny that the will of God is the factor of history, may think it almost a pity that the Church's work of the mission should be so unexpectedly accompanied by the Nation's work of the election. But have we not prayed God to regard this mission, to do good by it, to restrain any evil it may leave behind it? The parliamentary election is God's first answer to our prayer.

The parable may help us to gain some clearer notion about each. It may help us to perceive the real connection which underlies the mission and the election.

What is this mission? Viewed from its highest possible point, a mission is a sending forth of men by God. A missioner is one who believes that he can say, "I am sent; I do not come of my own will. This work I am about is not mine, but another's. The words I have to speak are not my words; they are the Lord's Word." The greatest of all missions, therefore, is that universal, common, and permanent sending-forth of workers which the Lord began on Whitsunday, and which has never ceased—the unceasing mission of the Church's existence. The Church's every-day life, as I sought to remind you during the excitements of "The Ten Days' Mission," is the most divine of all missions. This partial mis-

sion, which is now about to be held in three neighbouring dioceses of our part of England, can only be called a mission or a sending in a technical and abnormal sense. It is local, not universal; temporary, not permanent; exceptional, not regular: it will come to an end in a few days. But *the* mission, the great mission of the Holy Spirit and the Church, will continue unbrokenly in our ordinary life as Christian clergy and people. "The mission of 1874" is in fact a sort of loud cry of despair of the established bishops and priests of England, who, after centuries of labour in God's English vineyard, see who far their work is from being done. It is our cry to God the Holy Ghost to come and help us. This cry is a prayer to give at once force and strength to the labourers and life to the vines; to act upon His priesthood, and to act upon His Humankind. But, my brethren, such a prayer alone is not enough. When the Lord once looked upon a mass of men made and redeemed to bear good fruit for God's vineyard (or for mankind) and then looked upon those whom He had called and sent to labour at the culture of Humanity, how did He contrast the two? "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He would send more labourers into His harvest."

The counsel of the Lord to His first missionaries may help us to perceive the connection between the English mission and the English election. God's vineyard—and every part of the divine order He has

established in Humanity, every nation and every family, is a vineyard of God—does not stand in need of mere added quantity of workers. If every tenth man in England became a priest, the cultivation of England as God's for God would be little advanced. What God's human vineyard needs is not the mere quantity, but it is rather the new *character* of work which is called into place at the eleventh hour, at the season of ripeness, at the critical epoch. Holy and wise men for many generations thought Christendom would fall to pieces, that antichrist would be revealed and rule the earth, if the Roman Empire fell. All the blind conservative instincts of the old man in themselves clung about it, they connected with its stability the salvation of the rule of incompetence and disorder which they called "order." A Christendom without a Cæsar seemed to them to be impossible. They confounded the Empire with the civilizing and cultivating work of God in mankind. But how did the Lord God at that eleventh hour in history carry on the culture of His human race? He called new labourers into His vineyard. He called the dreaded Teutonic peoples out of the forests and marshes where their civilizing capacities lay idle. Christendom was saved and developed by the Goths, the Franks, the English, the Normans—by the hordes it trembled at. God's vineyard has again and again been cultivated, society has been saved and quickened with new and fuller life, by the very revolutionists at whom the effete and worn-out and luxu-

rious were frightened, whom they expected to tread down God's vines and make His vineyard fruitless and barren, and bring human society to ruin. The work in God's vineyard of the Church or of the State can never be done until *all* are called by the historical providence of its Lord into it. The place of idleness and uselessness must be emptied, the place of work and usefulness must be filled. The thing to be dreaded is not the admission of new men and new classes into the vineyard, but the suspicious temper with which they are regarded by the earlier possessors, their quarrel with their new fellows, and their complaint against the actual government of the Lord of life and history.

Some years ago, during the heat of our last parliamentary election, I tried my best to utter to you, my brethren, the words of truth and soberness. I tried to remind you that the act of taking part in the government of your nation ought not to be cut asunder from your acts here in the church. I have learned since then that many of you misunderstood all that I said. So I will not say to-day that you will be responsible to God for the votes you give. When I quoted the actual words of the Head of Humanity, to whom Liberals and Conservatives must be equally dear, you supposed (I know not how) that I was virtually canvassing from the pulpit for one of the political parties. I believe that a national priest, as a citizen, has the same right and duty as any other citizen, neither more nor less. The parish priest

is as free as the parish doctor to vote on which side he judges right. I believe that he not only abuses most atrociously the trust committed to him by God as a teacher of the catholic faith, but also the trust committed to him by the State as a national teacher, if he places his official standing at the service of a party, if he becomes a canvasser of his flock for their votes. I believe that a national clergy holds the same kind of relation to the Nation as a national sovereign. It must be the slave of neither party, it must be the leader of neither: it must be the mediator between the two: it must bear testimony to the national unity which underlies the contending parties.

We are told, indeed, at every fresh election that one party has as its end our disestablishment, the other party our continued establishment. But our actual relation to the Nation, the real union of Church and State, does not depend upon the State's acknowledgment of us; it rests upon the relation established by God Himself between His Church and His States. Establishment is but the temporary and attempted expression of this relation. It may not be the best and clearest expression of it. God may see it necessary to disestablish His English clergy in order to make them more fully the national clergy than they seem to care to be at present. It is far more important that we should acknowledge the sanctity of the State than that the State should acknowledge our sanctity.

The Church is the anvil, as Beza said long ago, on which the hammers of all parties must be broken. I can see little moral difference between the religious fanatics who talk of "robbing God," and the religious fanatics who demand what they call "religious equality." The former do not realise the relation in which the ministry of Jesus Christ *ought* to stand toward the nation. The latter do not realise the relation which the Church of Jesus Christ *does* bear to His Nations. Neither of them can realise what is the relation of the Church of all Nations to their own nation. I can see no moral difference between the fanatics who demand that the State shall enforce religious education, and the fanatics who demand that the State shall prohibit it. Let them tear one another to pieces. Each party looks after its own partial things, not after the perfect things of Jesus Christ—that is, after the things of God and of that whole Humanity which is one with God in Jesus Christ. Each wants to get the majority of English children as proselytes to its notions. Neither cares supremely that every English child shall have that fullest culture and hope of life which the Redeemer of the Nations is demanding for each. There will be plenty of party preachers on both sides to beat the drum ecclesiastic, to rouse up in Christian men the spirit and temper which crucified the Lord of the vineyard—preachers who confound their own wages as labourers with the holy labour to which they are called, preachers who grumble at the Lord of history,

preachers who speak as if mammon, and not He who had not where to lay His head, had become the owner and lord of the vineyard.

Therefore I shall not say again that you will be held responsible by God for the votes you give. But I shall say that you and I must answer to God for the spirit and temper in which we take part in high political acts. If the election could be carried on in the spirit and temper in which we desire the mission should be carried on, what good results would flow from each! Then it would matter little what party won at the poll. No party can arrest the progress of the kingdom of the Son of Man. It would matter little what immediate results were shewn from our preaching. God's liberating and enlightening Word cannot return unto Him void. God's vineyard would have been cultivated; for the hearts and lives of Christians would have brought forth that fruit of "the vine which maketh glad the heart of Man."

III.

MAN'S CITIZENSHIP AT ONCE ON EARTH AND IN HEAVEN.

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, NOVEMBER 15, 1868.

PHILIPPIANS iii. 20.

"Our conversation is in heaven."

I NEED hardly tell you that the word "conversation" does not include the whole of the idea presented by the Holy Ghost the Comforter to the mind of the imprisoned apostle. St. Paul says, "Our citizenship exists in the heavens." For his own consolation in trouble, and for their protection against the temptations of the flesh, he reminds himself and his children in God of their real estate. He and they are *citizens;* that is, they are not homeless, they are not exiles, foreigners, aliens. They are really in their own country, in which they were born, or into which they have been naturalized; they are living under its laws; they are possessing its rights and privileges; it is demanding from them all civic duties. He and they, he says, have citizenship in a wider, older,

nobler state than Rome, Jerusalem, or Macedonia. "Our citizenship subsists in the heavens."

Two questions lie athwart our way as we try to approach nearer to this apostolical view of the true condition of a churchman. What did he mean by a city? How can we, who are plainly on earth, have at the same time a citizenship which is in the heavens?

I.

St. Paul had not exactly the same conception of the city as that which presents itself to our minds when we hear or use the word. He was himself a citizen of two cities—of Rome and of Jerusalem, although of neither by local birth. He was born in Tarsus, a city of Cilicia, as he delights to say, "no mean city." By a privilege given by the Roman conquerors to his unknown father he was a citizen of the quasi-universal state of Rome, which destroyed or absorbed states. His birth of the holy tribe of Benjamin, and his circumcision as Abraham's son, had made him a citizen of the holy city and elect state. He was a citizen of Rome; he was a citizen of "the commonwealth of Israel."

When we speak of a city in our land, we think of a number of streets within walls or boundaries. We probably have some particular place in view which includes a cathedral church and a bishop's throne; although indeed the bishops' seats were first placed in cities because they were centres of citizenship. They

did not become cities because the fathers in God of the citizens settled in them. Those who know something of the place held by the city in the culture of mankind will rise above the thought of walls and houses; they will mean by it the human society of burghers or citizens within those walls, the freemen by birth or by grant, to whom belong all the noble rights and duties included within the term "citizenship."

The city, however, in its fullest sense meant a larger and nobler society and polity than this. The "Hebrew of the Hebrews" probably learned more of its meaning from the Jerusalem of David, Jeremiah, and Zerubbabel than from the Tarsus of his parents or the Rome of Tiberius. The city meant all that we mean by the sacred names of the State, the Nation, the People, the Fatherland. Our city, for instance, in the sense in which the apostle here speaks, is England. According to his use of the word, you and I are citizens though we live in a village. We are not citizens of Maidstone, the chief town of our county, nor of Rochester, in which the chair of our chief pastor is placed, nor of London, where some of us may have our business and even certain municipal rights; but we are citizens of England. Our citizenship is really our freedom, our franchise, our commune life. We are not citizens because we are natives or are subjects, but because we help to constitute and make the city—because we have the right to share in governing it, and in being

governed and protected by it. It is in the Christians' citizenship in a City or State which includes all spirits that St. Paul finds the ground for his wonderful question, "Know ye not that we shall judge angels?"

An unenfranchised man, although Jesus the King of nations may have declared him by the sacrament of baptism a citizen of the heavenly state or fatherland, is still in our nation a mere subject. He is not yet fully a citizen of the English state or fatherland. He is not yet (in the sense in which a Jew or a Christian of the first century could understand the term) one of the people. Wherever the catholic and human idea of a state is still at strife with the feudal notion of a state, there citizenship and nationality are not yet correlative terms; there every man is not a citizen as a man. That each native must become at last a full member of the nation, or that the nation must perish, we are taught both by the providential Word of the Father manifested in history, and by the words said to each child by the same Son of Man in that sacrament of baptism which He instituted for all nations and every creature. "Thou art an inheritor—a citizen, a burgess, a person endowed with the rights and duties, a person to submit to the laws, and to apply and administer the laws—of the Kingdom of Heaven. Though men hold thee unfit for their fellowship, I hold thee fit for My fellowship." The message uttered by the Holy Ghost, the liberating Spirit, through the imprisoned Apostle of the Nations to the church of Philippi—"Remember

that you are citizens of the heavenly eternal State"—this message is uttered by the same Spirit to every little English child brought to the font of baptism. The citizenship which was in the apostle's mind, and which he used in the prison as a parable of our relation as Christians to the eternal, supersensible, and universal order, is like that which the French Revolution gave to every Frenchman, and which, I believe, the late Spanish Revolution gave to every Spaniard. It is that nationality which God indicates as a man's inheritance by his nativity. In our land, "where freedom broadens slowly down from precedent to precedent," we may hope that this development on earth of the baptismal truth as it is in heaven may be reached by less ferocious and destructive methods, and so be more stable when reached. But I do not understand how any churchman can believe that the baptismal citizenship is intended for "every creature," and can labour and pray that every fellow-creature may possess it, and yet have no desire and make no effort that the national citizenship, the noblest image of the heavenly, shall fully belong to every fellow-Englishman.

II.

St. Paul declared that he and his Philippian children in Christ had a citizenship in the heavens. The rite by which the Jew struck down on the way to Damascus, and by which the first Europeans who

believed his gospel were admitted into the visible society of the Church, was a sacrament. It was an outward and visible sign of their admission into an invisible society and polity of God, into the citizenship of the city not made with hands—"a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Whether national citizenship be ours or not, this wonderful citizenship, the apostle says, is *ours*. It was his not as an apostle, but as a baptized man; it was, therefore, as much theirs to whom he was writing. It is, therefore, as truly ours. It is reclaimed for every child baptized in this church. As to be born in this nation of English parents gives us our title to nationality in England, so to be born again of water and the Spirit gives us our title to nationality in the eternal and supersensible nation which existed in the ever-blessed Trinity in Unity before the world was made. If I would "read my title clear to (something nobler than) mansions in the skies," I must, as Luther says, "go back to my baptism"—that is, to the common and universal title which the Father has given to Humanity, which the Son commands His Church to declare to "all nations" and "every creature." To be baptized in this parish is to be admitted, not merely into the church of this congregation, but into the church of the English nation; to be admitted into the church of the nation is to be admitted into the Catholic Church; to be admitted into the Church of the Humankind is to receive the sign and seal of our membership as human spirits

in that Kingdom, that Household, that Family, that Commonwealth, that City (for each of these titles of human fellowship is at times applied to that unseen Fellowship which eye cannot see, nor heart conceive, nor words fully describe) which subsists "eternal in the heavens." St. Paul told the church of Corinth that he had been caught up into the centre of the supersensible City, and there heard unspeakable things, which it is not lawful for a man to utter. The City of which we are citizens existed before any visible family, city, state, or church was made. Out of its womb, as "the Mother of us all" (as St. Paul elsewhere calls it), all visible families, cities, nations, and churches have had their birth.

This heavenly State the apostle assures us is really our own. He regards heaven as more ours than earth, or anything on earth. Indeed, all that we hold on earth becomes most fully ours when we hold it in heaven. This law embraces all our goods and all our deeds. Nothing is well done on earth except that which is "done on earth as it is in heaven." If we wish to keep our treasures we must lay them up, the King tells us, in heaven. If we lay them up on earth, a day will come when the moth and the rust will seize them, and we shall find ourselves treasureless.

III.

The sight by faith of a perfect City "in the heavens," to which he belonged as a citizen, must

have given unspeakable consolation to the apostle in the hour of his rejection by the cities to which he belonged on earth. Sion and Rome both issued out of the womb of the City above. The earthly "holy city" and the earthly "eternal city" were both after their kind earthly symbols of that Uncreated State. No other man who was living in the first century was so capable as the Apostle of the Nations of valuing and honouring each of these marvellous earthly capitals. The citizenship of the quasi-universal city on earth, which served him wherever he travelled, but of which he could be robbed, vividly suggested to him that really universal citizenship which belonged to him and to his Philippian children, from whose present and existing liberties and rights nothing but their own self-will could exclude them. Nay, even the churches on earth, which he had sometimes to correct and reprove by his presence and now by his letters, stained with the sins of their members, ever in fear of persecution and perhaps extinction, brought before his mind the Church in the heavens—the abiding, stainless City of God, against which no weapon can prosper. Every earthly polity, state or church, may sin away its being; but that "continuing City," after which the homeless patriarchs sighed and longed, still abides. That alone can be "the City" of which David perceived and sung things too glorious to be fulfilled by the city in which he lived and was buried. That alone can be the "Kingdom of Heaven," the "King-

dom of God," and the "Kingdom of the Father," for whose coming the forerunner of the Son prepared men by the preaching of repentance, and by turning the hearts of the fathers on earth to their children. That alone can be "the Household" of which the Son declared God to be the Householder. That alone can be "the whole Family"—the antitype and womb of all families, in which there has been and is and will be for ever the Father, and for ever the Son, and for ever the Spirit in Whom the Father and the Son are One.

The apostle knew that none of the names provided by the ordered forms of human life can perfectly correspond to that Order out of which they have proceeded. But St. Paul thought of it in prison, as St. John thought of it in lonely exile, as the City; and in this city, he told the Philippians, he and they had at that moment their citizenship. This conception of the present and existing state of the Church on the earth appears also in his letter to the Ephesians—"Ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the Household of God." It reappears in the letter to the Hebrews—"Ye are come unto the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the General Assembly and Church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant."

IV.

The apostle perceived in the hour of his rejection by the city of Jerusalem and his imprisonment by the city of Rome that the heavenly citizenship differed from his other citizenships in its continuing reality and presentness. "Our citizenship *is* in the heavens." He does not say ἐστι, but ὑπάρχει. Our citizenship—like our City, and like Him Who is the King of our City—*exists* or *subsists*. It is in *the* City. It has its origin and its perpetuity in the eternal Substance, in the ever-subsisting Fellowship of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The State which has given us its wonderful franchise and taken us into its fellowship is "the Kingdom which cannot be moved."

Everything that is eternal must be present. We shall not have the full fruition of it, we shall not enter into all its rights and immunities (as the apostle says in the next clause), until the Saviour appears out of the heavens, and the City appears with Him; but, though we have not the fulness of the estate, we are in the state. "It does not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him." We are citizens. We need not say, We hope hereafter to be citizens. What that great poet of ours, who (as Hazlitt said) made nature his home, wrote of our natural generation, "Heaven lies about us in our

infancy," the apostle here declares to be true of our regeneration, our new-born state as children of God. The heavens are not to be thought of as merely above us, as distant and far off in space or time; they lie "about us"—above us, under us, around us. "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you," or "is among you," says the King. We can breathe on earth the heavens' invigorating atmosphere. Nay, we do breathe it, and we live in and by it when we act in the Spirit of its crucified King, and of its other citizens, the angels who do His will, and the saints who have suffered patiently. Common men and women here on earth breathe back what the Spirit poured out on all flesh by the heavenly King has breathed into them, they respire what God has inspired, whenever they do good or patiently endure evil. This faith that the citizenship of the Church militant in the eternal and blessed city is a state thoroughly *present* not only sweetened and solaced the confessor's exile in the prison, but it permeates his whole doctrine as God's apostle of glad tidings. Thus he does not say to the Asiatic Churches (to whom also he wrote when he was in the cruel iron grasp of Rome) God will some day raise us up, and will some day make us sit in heavenly places; but he says, "God *has raised* us up together, and *made* us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." The writer of the letter to the Hebrews does not say, Ye shall hereafter come, but he says, "Ye are come unto the City of the living God."

I need not cite a chain of texts to show that the apostle cared more to state the present condition of the Church than its future condition. He says here distinctly, "Our citizenship *is* subsisting." He makes no use of an Arminian "it *may* be" or "it *can* be;" nor of a Calvinist "it *shall* be" or "it *must* be." He does not say, "You had better live above earthly lusts that you may go hereafter to heaven." He says, "You ought to live above them because heaven has come down to you and is encircling you." He does not say, "You shall perhaps come," but "You are come unto the city of the living God." You are now in the outer parts of that same city which includes all those mansions of the Father to which you aspire after death. "Things present, things to come, all are yours; for ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

V.

The fact that we men have this citizenship really, and that we have it now, has been a wonderful consolation to the troubled. Remember again what was the apostle's visible and temporal condition while this wonderful perception of his real and eternal condition was visiting him. He, the Roman citizen, was in a Roman prison. He, the member of the commonwealth of Israel, was exiled from Jerusalem and excommunicated from its temple. Recollect that there was never a greater patriot than this Hebrew of the Hebrews, never a citizen of any nation in whom the noble national spirit burned more eagerly than in the

heart of the man whom God chose from all eternity and from all men to be His Apostle of the Nations. Persecuted and rejected, both by the dear religious city of his fathers and by the splendid mistress-city of the then-known world—to each of which his great heart was glad to belong, of each of which he was the noblest citizen then living—the apostolical prisoner turned with an eager joy to the contemplation of the other City of which he was a citizen. My "citizenship subsists in the heavens." He was on earth; yet he perceived that he and the earth were in the heavens. He was in the most narrow and contracted spot which earth affords a man—in a prison; yet he perceived by faith that he was really in a city—in The City which has no limits, no bounds, no conditions; which has never had beginning, and never will know decay or end; a City which is everywhere present, is at once in the heaven of heavens and in the earth; a City which included the throne of the unseen God and his own dungeon. St. Paul plainly regarded his temporary imprisonment on earth as the apparent or temporal estate; he regarded his conversation and citizenship in the heavenly city as his real or eternal condition. Yes, for of this substantial and eternal *civitas* he was (and was not merely hoping to be) a citizen; he was holding at that hour all its rights, able at that hour to exercise its splendid duties and to enjoy its glorious liberties, able even to carry out and administer its wonderful laws. The short letters he was inditing to Europeans and

Asiatics from his prison were to have more power in the earth than all the edicts of the mighty Cæsar. The supreme law of that City in which he was living and conversing is the Will of a Father; and that Will was being done, that heavenly law was being kept and administered, as by His angels serving in happy liberty about the throne in heaven and throughout the boundless universe, so also by His ambassador serving in miserable chains in the prison on earth.

This faith in his real and present citizenship in the heavens harmonizes the apparent contradictions and apparent paradoxes which the apostle sometimes heaps together so profusely. Thus he describes himself and his evangelists in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, "As deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and, behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things." Though bound in the visible city, in the invisible City he is free. Though sorrowful as a citizen of Rome and of David's city, yet he is always rejoicing as a citizen of the City of David's Son and Lord. Though persecuted by the priests and kings below, he is not forsaken by the heavenly Priest and King. Though dying as a rebellious citizen by the Cæsar's sword in Rome, yet as the citizen of the universal and everywhere-present City of God, behold, he still lives.

But if the apostle's and an apostolic church's

citizenship was in the heavens, there too must be the abiding citizenship of all the christened. For what else have we been christened but to be witnesses for God that the true *human* citizenship is with Him? "The Tabernacle of God is with Men." This is the consolation which the apostle sends forth to all the members of Christ's households and families below in all their troubles. He assures them that they are in the Household and in the Family of Him "of Whom every family in heaven and earth (or the whole Family in heaven and earth) is named."

Faith in this real citizenship given us by the Father in the City which we cannot see is our protection in assault and in temptation. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews declares that the vision by faith of this most real City has been the support of every warrior for God and the right from the beginning of the world. Every doctrine which the apostle stated was for use. It is worth while to see what use this believer in our heavenly citizenship made of his earthly citizenship. He had found that the quasi-universal citizenship of Rome which he had by his birth was a protection to him and to the Gospel, both from Roman and Jewish persecutors, and he threw himself into the strong arms of that Roman citizenship more than once. "As they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned? When the centurion heard that, he went and told

the chief captain, saying, Take heed what thou doest: for this man is a Roman. Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea. And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born." The truly spiritual and heavenly-minded man is the least likely to despise the images of the spiritual and the heavenly Order here below. The Apostle of the Nations perceived that his Roman citizenship was a nobler type of such an Order than was that membership of a Jewish pharisaic world which he had renounced at his baptism into the universal fellowship of Jesus Christ. Out of the same perception came his later outburst before the judge who placed his office at the service of the religious world: "I stand at Cæsar's judgment-seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews I have done no wrong, as thou very well knowest. I appeal unto Cæsar."

The temptation which tried the apostle and the apostle's children when his liberty was restrained and his voice silenced was the same which had visited the King's forerunner and his disciples when he was shut up in Herod's prison. If we are citizens of one nation, we are aliens and foreigners of another, and we must not expect to exercise the rights of citizens there. If I go for a time into America or into France, I must submit to American and French laws; but I must not expect (unless I am naturalized) to have the right to interfere in their making or their adminis-

tration. If we are citizens in Sion, it is plain that we are strangers and aliens in Babylon. The tempter who rules in Babylon, the city of sin and confusion, will offer to naturalize us. To yield to our lusts or to the temptations of the prince of this world is to be naturalized, and have a citizenship in the world that lieth in wickedness. If we become the servants of sin, as the apostle says, we are then free from righteousness. It is the damnable privilege of the citizens of this world to keep all the commandments of the adversary of God and men, that is, to break all the commandments of mankind's Father and Redeemer. Hence to be citizens of the City in the heavens is at the same time to be (as St. Peter says) "strangers and pilgrims," aliens and foreigners, in the city of the world.

We know that there is an alien and foreign nature in each of us, an earthly man in each of us, which is estranged from God, which prefers Egypt to the Commonwealth of Israel, which longs to be at home in sin, and to exercise the devil's liberty, that is, license to sin. If it could, it would make its abiding city in the worldly disorder among the things it can buy and sell, see and handle, eat and drink. This carnal man within us has no desire to abide in the heavenly order, although it longs to go (when it has exhausted earth) to a *place* like earth which it calls "heaven," a classical Elysium, an Indian happy hunting-ground, a paradise in which fleshly lusts will find a fuller satiation than they can find on

earth, a fairyland such as the late Mr. Martin painted as the Christian heaven. It was St. Paul's sense of the power of the alien nature in himself and in all the mortal citizens of heaven which led him to put forth his bold statement of their true citizenship: "For many walk (of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ): whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things. For our citizenship is in heaven." Such men live as if they were foreigners in the heavenly kingdom, as if they were citizens of a hellish kingdom. By the incarnation of His Son and the sending into us of His Spirit, the Father has naturalized us into heaven, has given us the co-citizenship of angels and just men made perfect. By the apostolic doctrine, by the voice of the Spirit and the Church, He reminds us what we really *are*, of what a substantial City we are actually citizens, that we may not go like the prodigal into "a far country," and "waste our substance with riotous living," and "join ourselves to a citizen of that country."

"Civis Romanus sum" was the reply of the true citizen of Rome when he was tempted to do an ignoble or, as he would have said, an un-Roman deed. His exalted citizenship was present with him everywhere as the subsisting preservative against meanness and self-degradation. So we say of cowardice, it is un-English; we expect an English-

man's nationality to be self-respect and courage to him all over the world. So our citizenship in heaven is the grand reason which the apostle gives to the Philippians and to us why our lives must not be earthly or hellish, the great provocation by which he urges us to make them heavenly. He reproduces the method of the King in His sermon on the mount. He asks us to *be* what we *are;* that is, to be by our own will in all our thoughts, words, and deeds what we are by God's constitution of us in Christ Jesus, the children of our Father Who is in heaven.

VI.

This great statement of the Apostle of the Nations, occurring as it does in the Epistle of this week, ought to remind thousands of Englishmen of the right and duty to which Christ Jesus as King of the nation is this week calling them. So many of us as are actual citizens are called to exercise the liberty of our citizenship, to choose our representatives to sit in the council of "the powers that be." It would be easy, my brethren, to draw a contrast and parallel between England and the heavens, this citizenship and that, after the manner of heathen moralists, of monastic ascetics, or of puritans who are confusing unworldliness with other-worldliness. A man may easily say, "I am a citizen in heaven; therefore I am alien and a foreigner in England."

Such a saying would have appalled the Apostle of

Nations. St. Paul, because of his citizenship in the eternal heavenly Order, dreaded to despise or insult or neglect the citizenships which he had in Rome and in Israel. To him the family and the nation were each sacred cities, parts of the divine City, born from it as from a mother, included in it. Each national citizenship is a result of this universal heavenly citizenship. It is a treasure on earth which we may lay up in heaven, or may leave here for moth and rust to seize and spoil. Our citizenship in England ought to be to us a means of using, realizing, and manifesting our citizenship in the heavens. We never so much need the recollection of our invisible citizenship as when we are called to exercise our visible citizenship. We ought to take more and not less interest into our nationality here because we have this abiding nationality in the heavens. The principal material of our daily worship as Christians and Englishmen consists of the psalter, or the national song-book of patriot kings and prophets of the most national of all nations. There is scarcely a psalm which does not bear witness as we sing it that our citizenship on earth ought to be a vehicle in which we shew that our citizenship is in the heavens.

The divine order of the city (the nation or state) in St. Paul's time had three remorseless enemies. They were the three persecutors of the Nations' Apostle. First, the Cæsars were attempting to destroy the nations, and to make the whole world secularly

Roman. Secondly, the Pharisees were desiring a universal pope-king, an imperial Messiah, who would obliterate the nations, or at least make them servile to Jerusalem, and institute a Jewish Cæsarism. Thirdly, the National Apostle found fierce opponents within the Church in those first Ultramontanists who wished the Christian law and doctrine for all cities to go forth from the one city of Jerusalem. The whole life of St. Paul, as we learn from his epistles to the Church of Rome and the Churches of Galatia, was a long struggle against Ultramontanism or Cæsarism within the Church.* He had to protest against the judaizing of the catholic society, as we have to protest against the romanizing of it. As the Apostle of the Nations, he bore witness to the divinity and sacredness of nations. Every nation is born out of that unseen and eternal Nation which subsists in the ever-begotten Son Whose Kingdom all the kingdoms of the world are to become, and in the everlasting Father to Whom the Son will deliver up the kingdom, and in the ever-present Spirit, Who is the Inspirer or *In-breather* of the national distinctness which not alone

* It suits Monsignore Manning to speak of *Cæsarism and Ultramontanism* as opposites. But the second is the child of the first; the second has still its centre of jurisdiction in the city in which the first had its centre of jurisdiction. Cæsarism became extinct, after it had become a ghastly lie and pretence, with the death of the Holy Roman Empire. Napoleon was unable to institute a new French Cæsarism because God had made the nations too strong. In the death of the Holy Roman Empire we have the pledge of the death—if there be any divine and substantial order in humanity—of its child and imitator, the Holy Roman Papacy. The National Churches, of which the Catholic Apostle of the Nations was the true father, must become too strong for it.

the nation of Israel but every nation of history *breathes out* in its national language, its national law, its national literature, its national protest against Cæsars, against parties and sects, and against popes.

IV.

GOD SENDS HIS PROPHETS TO REBUKE THE CHURCH RATHER THAN THE WORLD.

OCTOBER 1, 1872.

AMOS iii. 1—3.

"Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt, saying, You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities. Can two walk together, except they be agreed?"

IN these words we have a summary example of the kind of testimony delivered by all the holy prophets as witnesses for God. The Lord God Himself calls the prophets, and sends them forth with His message. "Surely," says Amos, "the Lord God will do nothing, but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets."* In every age God calls some aside to whom He speaks His word and shews His will as the world's real King and present Governor with a wonderful distinctness; He sends them forth to make known His mind and will, and to utter in public what they have heard in secret. But to *whom*

* iii. 7.

does the Lord God send His prophets? Whom has He chosen as hearers of His prophetic word? Against what persons or what society are His prophetic threats directed? "Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O children of Israel," (not against any majority or any minority, but) "against the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt."

I.

God does not send any one of His prophets to the world. He does not send any one of them to all nations. To His apostles only, and not to His prophets, He says, "Go ye into all the world." To His apostles alone He says, "Go, teach all Nations." The apostolic function is the only universal function. The prophet's function is a limited one. No prophet, from Moses until John the Baptist, ever thought that God sent him unto the whole world; if any one who has claimed the name of prophet of God—like Mohammed, or John of Leyden, or the founder of Mormonism, or the Bishop of Rome since the Vatican Council—has pretended to a universal or catholic prophetic mission, he has so far shewn himself to be a false prophet. Every prophet's mission is to one people or nation, not to all nations.

It is not only true that no prophet is sent to the world in its universal sense, as including all nations and persons, but it is true also that no prophet is sent directly to the world in its theological sense,

that is, as including all persons or nations ignorant of God's covenant, and external to His Church. What the King of prophets said of Himself during His mission on earth you will find to be true in its degree of all the prophets, since He must be the archetype of them all, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." The prophets may often have to deliver a kind of subsidiary testimony against Egypt, or Babylon, or Philistia; but their witness against the world is but an episode in their great witness, which is always against the worldly Church, against the elect people of God, against the called and chosen nation, against the family God has taken into fellowship with Himself and made His witness by circumcision, or later by baptism. To the world, as human universe, the Lord God does not send prophets, but apostles. To the uncircumcised and unchristened He does not send witnesses of coming punishment, but a gospel of glad tidings, entreaties to accept His grace and turn to Him as Father. He sends the prophets to those whom He has graciously taken into fellowship with Himself, to whom He has made known the covenant which He has made with Humanity in Christ Jesus. But to those who do not know as yet that there exists for them in the relation of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost "an everlasting covenant ordered in all things and sure," He sends his apostles. To the world He utters His apostolical call, "Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins." To the Church, on

the contrary, He utters His prophetic word, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities. Can two walk together except they be agreed?"

II.

The recollection of this principle is of immense importance to us, my brethren, in the exercise of the educational function laid upon us as members of the Church. The Church—I mean by the Church, the whole body of the baptized, including laity as well as clergy—is God's chosen teacher of the world. "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." How can the members of the world glorify God? By becoming members of the Church, by confessing that He whom we worship as our Father is The Father, is their Father; by repenting of unfilial life; by taking up their places in God's family, and living a life of obedience as His dear sons and daughters. God does not now call the members of the world to the obedience of children so much by the voices of apostles or missionaries as by the daily life of the Church in the midst of the family or the nation. Your daily life and mine ought to be apostolic and missionary. The conversion of the world to God does not depend so much upon the eloquence of the Church's teachers, or upon the hard and business-like work of the Church's pastors, as

upon the reality and truthfulness of the Christian life of the whole body of the Church. It is the present will of God that "every member of the same in his vocation and ministry" should be living a wise, just, honest, and lovely life in the midst of mankind, for He has made the gathering of all the persons and families and peoples of the world into His family to depend upon the character of the life of the Church. It is certain that all the sins, follies, injustices, and dishonesties of His Church must be a thousandfold more horrible in the sight of God than the sins, follies, injustices, or dishonesties of the world.

Hence, if in our age God sends any prophetic messages about His will and mind, it must still be to His Church that He sends them. If He sends out threats of punishment, it must still be His Church which is to be the principal receiver of them; it is His Church which, whenever they come, must righteously bear the fullest bitterness of them. Since He has entrusted to His Church the awful responsibility of being His steward and mediator in the midst of Humanity, every judgment for Humanity will begin at the House of God; it must fall, as St. Peter says, most severely upon those men and women who constitute His organic household.

No word of rebuke has a just claim to be called a prophetic word unless it is uttered against the Catholic Church. No man exercises any part of the prophetical office who rails against the sins of un-

believers, heretics, and schismatics, or against the injustices of the State, or Nation. The angry and senseless words of scolders of the age, scolders of the state, scolders of the infidels, scolders of the sects, are their own words; they are not God's word. The word which the Unchanging God gives us to speak in this time, as in the time of Amos, must always be a "word that the Lord hath spoken against" his own Church, a word with which the Father rebukes His own adopted "children of Israel, the whole family which he has brought up." "Them only has He known of all the families of the earth; therefore He will punish them for all their iniquities." It is to each one of us upon whom He has put His Name that He says day after day in the Church, "*Thou* shalt not take my Name in vain." It is of us that he says, "The Name of God is blasphemed among the nations through you."

I do not think that I could bring before the Churchmen of our time a more practical principle than this, or one more in harmony with the prophetic word. Instead of being shocked at our own infidelity, our own faithlessness, and our own godlessness, we are fast settling ourselves in a habit of amazement at the infidelity and godlessness which we think we see outside the Church. Instead of submitting our own diseases to the gracious Physician, we rail at the evil caused us by what we rightly or wrongly think the diseases of others. It has become a miserable habit with us to indulge especially in railing at the

State or Nation, or at the civil government of the State or Nation, under the name of "the world." The habit would be wicked if it were not utterly thoughtless and ignorant; and so far as our thoughtlessness and ignorance are voluntary, it is wicked; it is one of those iniquities for which the Lord God declares to His chosen ones that He will punish them. If the Lord God has laid the burden of the prophetic office upon me, and He must have laid some part of it upon every priest as a teacher, it is my duty only to exercise it within the limits within which He has circumscribed it. If I think the State or Nation to be a part of the wicked world, I have no vocation as a prophet to testify against its sins. The prophet is God's witness to the sanctity and divineness of the society whose sins he is sent to denounce. The State, however, is no part of the wicked world as such, no more than the Family is. Each of them is as divine and sacred a society as the Church is. The State is the result of God's own Kingship, the Family is the result of His own Fatherhood, and He has instituted each of them to save men from worldliness.

But, apart from this, the witness which we so often utter against the State is not only our own witness instead of God's, but it is as often false witness. Nothing seems to me more shocking and more provocative of the swift judgment of God against our iniquities than the way in which, at public meetings, in newspapers, and even in sermons, we fling about, like raging firebrands, the epithets "god-

less," "infidel," "apostate." We say that the State has become godless and infidel; we imply that there was a time in which it was more godly and believing than it is now. We speak as if the godliness of the Nation depended upon its securing to a certain number of the national clergy—those of our order who are "established"—the incomes they now receive as bishops or priests, or upon its contributing certain sums of money to all the schools in which different and contradictory theories of Christian Faith are taught. It is wonderful how the worship of Mammon or property, the great Baal of our Israel, is confounded by us in most Church questions with the worship of the Father. The most godless or infidel placard I ever read was put forth at a contest for place on a school-board, and ran something in this way, "Vote for the use of the Bible and the keeping down of the rates." We try to excite the nervous imaginations of the weak in faith and weak in knowledge by drawing horrible pictures of a possible and even probable future godless education of the nation. No education can be altogether godless which teaches children no more than to tell the truth, to be honest, to be pure, not to covet, to sacrifice themselves for others, to reverence our noble national traditions, and live for the nation and not for money.

God has provided each child who is born into the world with three educators—parents, to educate him as kinsman in the family; the state, to educate him as a citizen in the nation; the episcopate, the priest-

hood, and the fellowship of the baptized, to educate him in humanity and godliness, as child of man and child of God, as member of the eternal and universal society through which he enters into the fellowship of the ever-blessed Trinity in Unity. We, my brethren, are the universal or catholic teachers whom God has sent into "all nations." To us He has committed the word with which we are to teach the teachers, the word which we are to utter to parents and school-masters and statesmen as educators, yes, even more than to children and pupils. Our utterance of His word does not depend in the least upon our possession of any other schools except schools of the prophets. It is a great trust to have possession of such a number of grammar-schools and parochial schools. But the success of God's word amongst men does not depend upon our possession of them. The Church never uttered it more victoriously, she was never more thorough and successful an educator of the nations, than in those ages in which all schools except the few catechetical schools for her clergy, like the famous ones at Antioch and Alexandria, were in the hands of those who believed God's word to be false, and who approved or advised the punishment of those who spoke it. The pulpit will always be the chief seat of the catholic educator. If God's promise is to be trusted, education can never become really godless and infidel—that is, God's word cannot return to Him void—unless the Church first becomes godless and infidel. Our own godlessness and infidelity are, at all

events, the godlessness and infidelity we have mainly to fear. None can teach a more godless lesson to English youths and maidens than we are already teaching them if we ask them to accept our illusion that God was nearer to men in past ages than He is to us in our age. We are already teachers of infidelity if we are teaching men to disbelieve that Christ Jesus exercises the same power and dominion over the conscience and reason of men in this century as He exercised in past centuries. The catholic faith is that "He sitteth"—that He is now at this instant sitting—as Ruler of all and Pastor of all, at the right hand of the Father. We hold some form of disbelief, instead of really holding fast this faith once delivered, if we mourn over past things, if we stand wailing and wringing our hands over dead and perished conceptions of the State's duties and relations. We are shewing no faith until it is our study to understand the immediate and present secret of the Lord God which He engages to reveal unto His servants the prophets.

III.

We shall shew our godliness and our faith by accepting the judgments and punishments with which the Lord God may visit us, whatever humbling form they may take. He has sent us into the Nations as their educators; He has covenanted to give us the Word and the Spirit. He may please to take from the English Church her present share and place in

the schooling of the English State, and give the whole of it into the hands of the State. But He will never take from us our everlasting commission, "Go ye into all Nations, teaching them," "Preach the gospel to every creature." He will open to us ways for the fulfilment of our commission among our own fellow-citizens, if we only have faith to perceive these ways and courage to enter into them. He has so made every Englishman and every man, that our fellow-citizens and fellow-men have demands in their nature, which no other teaching can satisfy but that word which He has committed to us as teachers of "all nations" and of "every creature." Schooling of the most complete and perfect kind has never yet stifled these demands in any human spirit; it has intensified them in thousands; it seems to have awakened them in others. The heathen and philosophic schooling of St. Justin Martyr and of St. Augustine did not hush the inward cry of their spirits for knowledge of God, it quickened it. The so-called "religious education" of the Jesuits in their colleges, on the contrary, produced first the secret and then the raging infidelity of France. Great fathers of the Church were educated by heathens and unbelieving philosophers. The leading atheists and infidel *philosophes* of the French Revolution were the pupils of Christian priests. Whatever it costs us, we must make up our minds to understand the sign exhibited to us by our Sender in the lives of many deists and atheists. He has not given any promise to the schooling of children by His clergy; He has tied His promises

to their faithful delivery of His everlasting gospel. If the schooling of every child in England were put this day into their hands, it would not carry with it—as the history of the Jesuit schooling in the College of Louis le Grand distinctly shows—any certainty of its issue in a generation of Christian men and women. The English clergy have had for years the greatest part of the schooling of the nation in their hands, in the universities, in the great charity-schools, and in thousands of parochial schools. Yet the Church of England has to confess before Jesus Christ and before Christendom the scandal that her churches are mainly filled with the prosperous middle classes, in whose schooling her clergy have had comparatively little part. Of those poorer classes whom we clergy have so largely schooled we have lost nearly all. They turn their backs upon the Church the moment they turn their backs upon the Church's school. The public-house fellowship attracts them; the trades-union attracts them; the political meeting attracts them; one sect attracts some of them, another sect others. But how few of them does that fellowship attract which of all fellowships is most their own! Our wisdom as the holders of a prophetical or preaching office, called to be seers and discerners of God's word in our own times, must lie in probing to their roots the causes which attract them more powerfully elsewhere thar to the Church.

If the truthful words of the prophets of any age or nation set before the Church her own sins, and her consequent affliction and judgment they also indicate,

her only hope. "Can two walk together," asked the Hebrew prophet, "except they be agreed?" Who are these two? The Father and His family; Christ and His Church; God and believers; the Spirit and the bride; the wandering Church and the Divine voice which calls the Church back into the path lighted by the Divine vision—the path of truth, the way of justice. The Church complains, "Men are departing from me." The prophets say to the Church, "Thou hast departed from God!"

God has called us by baptism into the fellowship He has made betwixt Himself and our whole race in His Son Jesus. The root of men's disagreement with the Church is to be found in the Church's own disagreement with God. God sends no prophet to rail for the Church at the State, or at the sects, or at the infidels. God sends all the prophets to call back the Church herself to willing fellowship of heart and mind with Him. His prophets, as the whole Church will soon be confessing outwardly by the Advent season, call us Christians to repent, they threaten us Christians with punishment for our own iniquities; they uncover to us our ownsores. They do not shew us the State's ungodliness, but our own ungodliness. They do not rouse us by their trumpet call to assail the infidelity of the world, but to confess and repent of our own infidelity. They do not bid us cast down the idols of the heathen, but the idols of our own parties, of our own brains, of our own hearts.

V.

THE WITNESS OF THE CREATION TO THE PROMISE OF THE SON OF MAN'S APPEARING.

ADVENT SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 29TH, 1874.

2 ST. PETER iii. 4.

"Where is the promise of His coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation."

THE aim of the letter called the Second Epistle of St. Peter is one with the aim of the Epistle of St. Jude, to which it has so remarkable a similarity in its language. The writer of the one letter must have had the other letter before him, or he must at least have held it in his memory. It would be out of place in an Advent sermon to expend the time in debating whether the longer or the shorter letter was the earlier of the two.

It is the pastoral aim of both writers to warn the Church against false teachers who belong to the Church in outward life without belonging to her in heart and reason. They "privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that

bought them." They will have great success. "Many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of; and through covetousness shall they make merchandise of you." They will vindicate their right to the position of teachers in the Church by pretending to be rational enlighteners of the faithful, telling them that they are "following cunningly devised fables" when they believe that Christ has risen from the dead, and when they believe that Christ will come again. Their question will take the form of an appeal to the understanding of believers. We may say that such men are unbelievers and rationalists. So indeed they are; but this is not a sufficient designation of their character. The foreteller of their question goes deeper; he shews us what it is which makes men unbelievers and rationalists in the worst sense of those words.

I.

The apostolic writer does not set down the question of these rationalising questioners until he has indicated their general moral character, and has pointed to the source of their unbelief, by calling them "*scoffers*, walking after their own lusts." In the Greek original his description of their character is more intense: he calls them "in scoffing scoffers (ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται), according to their own lusts going about and saying, Where is the promise of the coming of Him?" There will be a derisive and

mocking temper in these questioners; this temper will be the source of their question. The same word (ἐμπαῖκται) is rendered by St. Jude as "mockers." The same word is used by St. Mark and St. Luke to describe the mocking and derisive action of the soldiers and the chief priests toward "Him that is to come" during His passion; and it is used by St. Matthew to describe the secret and hasty departure of the Magi as it presented itself to Herod's mind.

Such men will ask such a question because they are mockers and scoffers. But they have become mockers and scoffers by no unusual or extraordinary human process, but by the very ordinary human process of "going about after their *own lusts*," or, as St. Jude says, "walking after their own ungodly lusts." Many who do not ask this question may, therefore, be at one with them in the ground of their character. Many who ask their question may, nevertheless, be utterly unlike them in the ground of their character.

Some, certainly, there are in the present state of human thought who are no scoffing scoffers, and who are not "walking after their own lusts," who would give all they possess to be able to believe that the "same Jesus" Who lived and died in Jewry eighteen hundred years ago will appear again to this world, and will be the final judge of the living and the dead. They wish and desire it; but they cannot dare to believe such good news, such a gospel and such a faith, to be absolutely true. It is in great

part the fault of the Church-teachers who have preached His advent as a threat instead of a promise, that such persons ask in sorrow, and not in scoffing, "Where is the promise of His coming?"

There is no need for us to swell the yelling chorus raised around us against external disbelief. The apostolic indication of the character out of which the scoffing question was to arise makes his warning useful to us who do not frame the question with our mouths. We continue to say, "We believe that Thou shalt come to be our Judge." Do we mean that He will appear only as the Judge for the Church, and not as the Judge also against the Church? If we are at present like the scoffing questioners in the ground of our character by walking after our own ungodly lusts, although we may wish to punish and excommunicate them for asking such a question, we shall be as unable as the worst of them to endure His appearing. Are we going about according to our lust? We know in that case that we are desiring with our whole heart that He will never come again, or at least that He will not come until we are other than we are. The coming of a Messiah is the hope of the Jews; but the rich Jewish speculators in Salonica (thè city whose Church first received the most eschatological of St. Paul's letters) told two English travellers a few years ago that it was their hope that their Messiah would not come in their day, because His appearing would confound and ruin all their speculations.* As

* "Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey in Europe." By G. M. Mackenzie and A. P. Irby. 1867. P. 14.

these Jews had at once a hope and a fear, so we may at once hold the faith and be virtual infidels. Our Judge Himself has described the kind of man who is an infidel although he is a believer, and is an evil rationalist while he accepts His coming as a sure fact: "The evil servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth His coming; and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken." Thus the Lord shews us that we can interpret the warnings of the two late biblical writers without going out of ourselves. To live after our own ungodly lusts, to smite our fellows in word or thought or deed, to make it our first care what we shall drink or eat or put on—to live as if we were brutes and not spirits, to live as if we were mere individual souls, and not members of the universal family and household of God the Father and the Lord—this, my brethren, may be our way of saying, "Where is the promise of His coming?" The creed of the good servants which we sing in the church may be our professional creed; the creed of the evil servant will be our actual creed. Our reason and conscience will tell us that that Appearance which is "the promise" to our fellow-servants is made by ourselves a threat to us.

II.

It was probably not without taunt that the scoffing questioners said to the Church in an age of exile and persecution, "Where is the *Promise* of His coming?" The questioners of that time had no doubt as to the

relief of spirit and hopefulness of temper with which the Church was then anticipating the appearance of the Son of Man. Their question bears lucid witness to the mind in which the Church was looking forward for the dawning of the great Lord's Day. To the apostolic Church it was indeed to be "The Day"—the glorious and gladdening ending of the world's long night. The Son of God had left at His departure many exceeding great and precious promises; but His assurance that He would come again was by far the greatest and most precious of them all: this was recognised by the universal consciousness of the believers as absolutely "*The* Promise." The churches into whose chairs of teaching these scoffers "crept in," probably thought that their history would be a very short and sharp one—tribulation for a little while, and then, as the angels promised at the first advent, the greatest joy for them and for all people. With the promise of His appearing always before them, nothing could daunt their hearts. Whatever they suffered, whatever they endured, they hoped more. Their greatest temptation, while their fellow-servants were smiting them, was to be impatient with their Lord for delaying His coming.

Could any scoffers of our day possibly bear such a witness to the character and quality we are giving to the appearance of the Son of Man? Would they not be more likely to taunt us with the question, "Where is the threat of His coming?" It has probably become the one event (for those who think of Christ's

appearance mainly as a future event) which is more dreaded by the Church than anything else in the womb of the future. "Let anything happen in my time, O God"—thus we should often pray, if we prayed only as we think and feel—"except one thing, Thy coming! Our Adversary (Whom we strangely call our Father), let not Thy will be done yet on earth as it is in heaven; let not Thy kingdom yet come!" It was once thought that the saying of the Lord's Prayer backwards was a sure way of raising the devil. But he needs no raising, he is already here, he is the director of our consciences, he is the inventor of our religion, he is our doctor of divinity, if we are not praying to God as our Father Who loves us more than we can love ourselves, and if we are not desiring the coming of His Son to do His will universally, and establish His kingdom everywhere and for ever. We were made men and spirits that we might desire this, and unless we are desiring it we do not yet know God's will to be our Father's will, and God's kingdom to be our Father's kingdom. "Beloved," says the apostle, "now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is. And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself even as He is pure."

If we preach this external hope to a man, it is often with the end of quickening despair rather than hope "in him." We have let slip our grasp of the old

catholic and apostolic faith that the glorious appearing of the Son of Man—or the coming of the Father's kingdom, and the complete doing of the Father's will—is a necessary part of the gospel. The glad tidings which God sends to "all Nations," and to "every creature," concerning His relation to them, must be incomplete unless this be a part of it. Do we cease to sing, do we begin to groan and lament, when in the solemn liturgy of the Church we come to those words of the creed, "We believe that He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead, and His kingdom shall have no end?" There is no gospel, or good message to the whole Humanity, if there is not such a judgment and such an endless kingdom. Some last judgment and some kind of endless kingdom must be a part of the belief of every rational creature. Who will pronounce the last judgment? Who will introduce the endless state? These are most serious questions for Humanity, for "all Nations" and for "every creature." Such questions the apostles and the Church have answered in the evolution of the creed out of the evangelical germ. But we check this evolution, we trample upon this noble and living germ. We sever this one article of the faith once delivered from the unity and proportion of the faith: we treat it as some severed truth standing alone and by itself. Instead of proclaiming it as a part of the gospel to struggling and half-despairing men who are longing for a perfect justice and a perfect kingdom which cannot be moved, we have used

it as a mean argument to entice men or as a mean threat to frighten them into the acceptance of some parody of God's good news to every creature, which we call the gospel. Do we believe that God's will is a good will for men, and His kingdom the best estate in which men can find themselves? A promise! Surely this is the last name which our unevangelized conscience dares to give to the Father's assurance that He will send His Son, that His Will shall be done, and His Kingdom shall come. St. Peter, who is reputed to have written this Epistle in his old age, said in one of the earliest of his sermons, "The times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and He shall send Jesus Christ, Which before was preached unto you; Whom the heaven must receive until the times of the Restitution of All things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began."* Our tongue can hardly express the intensity or the universality of St. Peter's language.†

What the last advent of Jesus Christ fully means, I have never known, and I will not pretend that I now know. St. John, who leaned upon His bosom, and who had the most wonderful "revelation," confessed in his old age that he and the Church of his time did not know. We can draw no horrible picture of it which will not be a mere caricature of its awfulness,

* Acts iii. 19—21.

† Καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου. Ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων.

and no luscious picture of it which will not degrade our conception of its gladness. "But we know," says St. John, "that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." All that we definitely know of it, all that we can preach of it, is, that it must mean all that we ought to hope for ourselves and for every creature. The whole creation, says the apostle of the nations, is groaning for the manifestation of the sons of God, that is, for the everlasting proof and seal that we sons of men who are asked to regard ourselves as concatenations of molecules are the children of the Eternal.

III.

The placid quiet of that very creation which the nations' apostle declared to be groaning and restless, was the standing argument upon which the contemporary scoffers grounded their question—"*Where** is the promise of His appearing? The questioners pointed to the enduring unchangeableness, to the past and present continuity and regularity of the world's visible order. "For," said they, "since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. There is the old sun; it is not darkening: there is the old moon; it is not turning into blood: there are the stars; they are still unfallen: here is the globe, firm and solid as ever under our feet. The ancient

* Πού.

heavens and ancient earth give no sign of becoming other than they were when the patriarchs and prophets lived and died. Did they not live and die under an illusion? Where is the promise? Let us see some of its evidences: it is time they should show themselves." This was the illusion of those old scoffers at Christian belief and Human hope.*

The questioners were not altogether consistent in speaking of the fathers "falling asleep," or in speaking of the "creation." They should have said, "All things continue as they were since the particles once called Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob dissolved and fell asunder." We are constantly being told by questioners, whom I will not call scoffers, that we must not speak of the universe as a creation, nor even think of ourselves as creatures. Yet those who suppose they have renounced the whole faith of Christendom are obliged to use the ideas and words which are not only Christian but human. Indeed, they would not be Christian if they were not human. The chief of the English positivists speaks of "the invariable laws under which Humanity is *placed*." He speaks of "space, the second great *creation*, which completes the central one of Humanity."† Are not our minds confounded rather than liberated when we are asked to feel that we are "placed," and yet to be uncertain whether we have

* *Illusores*, as the Vulgate aptly names the ἐμπαῖκται.

† R. Congreve, "Essays, Political, Social, and Religious."

any Placer? By what feat of thought can we regard ourselves as a creation, and yet at the same time be in suspense as to whether we have had any Creator?

Only let that be granted which the common language of Humanity granted by the mouths of the ancient scoffers; let that be granted which the noble vulgar tongue grants by the pen of modern questioners. The languages of Humanity were reclaimed by the Spirit Who is the creation's life-giver as His inspiration on the birthday of the universal Church. Only let that be granted which every believer in order and law holds in common with the Church, that in some beginning, some power or word laid the foundation of the heavens and of the earth, or of the marvellous primary atom out of which a universe has been evolved.

"Where is the promise?" Where but *there* in the very creation to which we are directed? There, in the κτίσις, the firmly founded, firmly settled order. There, in the creatures so well begun and so well developed. There, in that very continuity and permanence of the universe. Why are heaven and earth, sun and sea, rocks and trees, and the natural life of man, permanent and continuous? Because they are "placed under laws." They are upheld by laws; they are obeying laws: they keep as they are because they keep laws. *Duty*, of which they can have no such consciousness as we have, preserves them in the sphere the Lord God made for them. "Thou," says

the English poet of nature and the creation, speaking to duty—

"Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong,
And the most ancient heavens *through Thee* are firm and strong."

But what is duty? Duty is that which is due, that which is owed: it is debt, it is obligation. To be what they are, to keep as they are, to move along the courses which have been indicated for them—this is the duty, this is the regularity, the harmony with God's original *regula*, the obedience to His law, which all parts of the great physical creation are not only always owing but are always rendering to God. Duty, you will remember, is one of the first thoughts brought before the conscience of the Church in this Advent season by the very first word of the first eucharistic Epistle for Advent. "*Owe* no man anything but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the *law*." The apostle of the nations wrote these words to the little Church dwelling in the eternal city, the centre of law to the then known world. But of what law did he speak? Of that law under which the Father of spirits has as certainly placed His spiritual creation as He has placed His physical creation under the law which it is obeying, and which is at the root of its permanence and continuity. Its law it never breaks. We know that we are breaking our law. Its duty it never ceases to do: we cannot deny that we are constantly leaving ours undone.

You think that God cares so much for His sun

and stars, heaven and earth—which are but the images of His thoughts—that He has placed them under law, and by law is preserving them to this day from irregularity and wrong. Do you think that He can care less for His creature man, who is the image not merely of His thoughts but of Himself, and is a lord and a knower of the other creatures? Do you think that He has made us and redeemed us in the likeness of that Son Who from eternity has been doing His will and obeying His law, that we alone throughout the creation should remain wilfully outside law, that we only should be its permanent violators, that we only should live for ever out of duty, we only be eternally in the wrong, that we only should be "placed" under a law of being continuously lawless?

Yet does not this appear at present to be the condition of Humanity? Look from the physical to the spiritual and human creation. Look from the sun and stars to us, whom St. James calls the first fruits of God's harvest of the creatures. Look from the likenesses of God's thoughts to the likenesses of His Trinity in Unity. What is the difference which the most casual observer must at once perceive? Is it that the most perfect creature, Humanity, is in perfect harmony with the law of God, more regular in duty than the less perfect creatures, sun, or star, or sea, or beast, or flower? The war between duty and wrong which goes on in your own bosom, the world-long battle

between righteousness and lust which is the summary of Humanity's development and history—ah, any morning's glimpse at a newspaper which relates what Humanity was doing on the previous day will give an answer. Our kind in its entirety is as far less perfect in actuality as it is far more perfect in possibility than a stone is, or than the sun is. Every stone is all that God meant it to be. His perfect will does not desire that it should be better than it is, or other than it is: His will is opposed by no contradictory will in His creature. But can any of us, the spiritual sons and daughters of God, say of himself or herself, "I, too, am in harmony with the law of God for Humanity; I am exactly that which the perfect will of God desires and purposes a human creature should be?" Only the Son of Man can say this; because He can say it, He is coming to be our Judge. Every leaf might say, if it could speak, "I am God's idea of a leaf." Every atom and molecule might say, "I am exactly that which God desires me to be." No man can say, "I am God's idea of a man," except that Son of God Who by the mystery of His incarnation has summed up all us men into Himself, and is constituting us a Humanity.

This thought, my brethren, must not be employed by us as a mere speculation or argument, but after the apostolic example in every Epistle to every Church, as a call to common and daily duty. The less perfect creatures of God, which are so stable and consistent, are already obedient to God's law

for them; they do nothing but their duty. The more perfect creature, man, who is able to see "sermons in stones," which stones cannot see in mankind, who has discovered that the other creatures are not his gods, who is more and more realizing that they are all subject to law—he alone has yet to come perfectly under law. The promise of the Son of Man's appearance is the promise that He who made our Humanity is determining Himself to perfect it. "Wherefore," as St. Peter says in his First Epistle, "gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ."

IV.

Let us ask ourselves more strictly what we mean when we sing as a part of the gospel or the catholic faith—that is, the belief necessary for universal humanity—"He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead." Let us look through the accessories of His advent to judgment, at which we have been content to stay, to the judgment itself. The clouds, the mighty angels, the dread trumpet, the flaming fire, are symbols drawn from our insufficient language; they are names which we have transferred from the things we see and hear to the things eye has not seen, nor ear heard. But what is the positive idea of judgment? Is it only the punishment of few or many malefactors? So the malefactors

may be conceited enough to think. But how does the judge himself regard it? As the vindication of the law against lawlessness, as the liberation of the whole society from the evils which injure it and threaten it, as the salvation of all that ought to be saved and the damnation of all that ought to be damned, as the re-establishment of outraged order, as "the restitution of all things." Human society is a corporation of honest men; this is the reason why thieves are cut off from it, and idlers and vagabonds are forced against their will to work. Men are held together in unity by the bonds of kindliness and charity; therefore murderers and slanderers are punished. But our judgments are imperfect, since they cannot make thieves honest, nor vagabonds useful, nor murderers charitable; we can avenge Humanity, but we cannot re-create it. The original Lawgiver and the abiding Judge has promised to appear to the whole universe, and to each creature. He must right every wrong. He must establish His glorious law universally and everlastingly. He will abolish all lawlessness out of His creation, in every part of it, for ever and ever.

As God has made all creatures in their order, so He assures us, by the promise of His appearing, He will perfect all creatures in their order; first the lower, then the higher. Humanity, the last created, will be, according to the gospel, the last to be perfected. "It does not yet appear what we shall be." If the doctrine of the evolution of a Humanity out of an infini-

tesimal atom be true, then God has been busy at this work ages upon ages longer than we supposed; we owe more to Him than we have yet thought or spoken; in no cycle of our development did it appear what we were in time to be; He has given us a more amazing pledge of His appearance. Until the perfection of Humanity by the appearance of the Son of Man, there must still be something wanting to the perfection of the remainder of the creation which "we see not yet put under Him." As one apostle declares that the whole groaning creation earnestly expects and waits for "the manifestation of the sons of God" in us who seem to mere sense to be nothing but particles which for a longer or shorter period hold together, so another apostle declares that when humanity is perfected there will be a new heaven and a new earth. "The promise of His coming" promises more than we are able to conceive.

If, then, a Christian is asked in our day, "Where is the promise of His coming?" he ought to answer, "It is *everywhere*." We are not yet contemplating any of the creatures with Christian insight unless we see some hints of this promise written upon them. If the promise be true, it must be written in each atom of the creation. Does not every scientific explorer who is a man in a Humanity, and not a mere member of a scientific world—which may be quite as worldly and contra-human as a religious world or a fashionable world—regard the creation itself as a splendid "promise"? I imagine that it must

give to such a man continual hints and visions of a use which has not yet been made of it, but which ought to be made of it. I imagine that it must also speak to him incessantly of a perfection which has not yet been reached by the creation as a whole, but which is destined for it by the fact and character of its being. Can we say that the creation is sufficient to help itself? If "the beginning" of the creation could only have its origin in the good power of One who is the Good; if it can receive nothing in its course except from that power in which it began, it must have its end and perfection from the same source of its goodness. It is as impossible for it to perfect itself as it was for it to create itself. Our end as God's "creation" was indicated in our "beginning." Whatever in our growth and process is contradictory to our beginning must be destroyed in our end. "The promise of His appearing" is not only written in that dutiful submission to law which marks His whole physical creation: it is written also in the undutifulness which is manifested in His human and spiritual creation, and which separates it so strangely from the physical creation. It is written in the rebellion of an old man in Humanity against law and in the strangely co-existent craving of a new man in Humanity to be under law.

To all those who believe in the Son of God and look for Him, His perfect appearing is promised afresh in each of those advents by which He now comes to us, judges us, and delivers us from the evil

which is threatening to master us. "The promise of His coming" confronts us in His sacraments, in His inward dealing with us by His Spirit, in His providential ordering of life and history, in His presence in poor or needy or wronged humanity. He has told us that our manner of treating Him in this latter form of His coming is the test by which He is now trying us, and that when He appears both the humane and the inhuman will discover with amazement that the Son of Man is One whom they have known: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these, My brethren, ye did it unto Me; inasmuch as ye did it not to the least of these, ye did it not unto Me." He instituted the sacrament of the Eucharist, as the apostle says, that it might be the unceasing link of continuity between His first and His last advent. It is to be celebrated "till He come." In it He now comes, although He does not yet appear. He tells us that the bread which we see, upon which He bids us to look, is His body which we do not yet see. Every time that He says, "This is My body, this is My blood," He is not only representing Himself as the one sacrifice, perfect and sufficient, He is not only giving Himself as our meat and drink, but He is shewing us the ordained pledge that He will fulfil "the promise," and will "come to be glorified in His saints and admired in all them that believe."

Perhaps He has visited some of you by an advent of judgment, and brought upon you some disastrous

failure and punishment. It was not a mere judgment against you; it was a judgment for you. By the fierce battle for selfish success, by the self-esteem which was separating you from your kind, you were warring with Him and separating yourself from Him Who is helped in your fellows and is persecuted in your fellows. He has called you to pass from your false position at His left hand, to move by repentance and new life to His right hand, to put yourself in the true human position under His government, to conform yourself to His saving law. So at least the Psalmist felt after one of His advents to judgment: "It is good for me that I have been afflicted; for before I was afflicted I went wrong: but now I *know Thy Law.*" To know what He is Who will appear, to look forward to His appearance as the promise of God to our race, and not as the threat of God against it, we must study His witness to Himself written in the gospel and perpetuated in the sacraments. Then we shall be able to renounce the inherited habit of regarding the appearance of the Perfect Judge as a promise to the pharisees who think themselves better than the general Humanity, but as a terror to the penitent publicans and sinners whom He once accepted, and to the common sort and crowd of men and women who once hailed His coming into their streets with joy. The Son of Man, the Head of Humanity, has taken care to warn us, in the parable to which I have already referred, that we shall not fit ourselves for facing His wrath by cutting

ourselves off from Humanity, but that we shall prepare ourselves for seeing Him at the end with joy by seeing Him now in every creature of His and our flesh and blood, and by identifying ourselves as He did and as He does with the sinful and needy of our kind.

VI.

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT, DECEMBER 6, 1868.

2 ST. PETER i. 19.

"We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts."

THE Church gives a peculiar prominence to the Holy Bible during this week, and during this week alone out of all the weeks of the year. The Epistle of the English Church is, as usual, that of all the other western National Churches; our Holy Gospel and our Collect (founded evidently upon the Epistle) are different.

I have chosen this text because I think it will help us to discover the connection between the Bible and the Advent. "We have," says St. Peter, "also a more sure word of prophecy." The words form part of the Epistle of a festival still retained in our kalendar, although the revision of its offices was omitted, for reasons we have neither time nor need here to consider—the Transfiguration of our Blessed Lord. Of

this strange event of the first Advent of the Incarnate Word, the apostle of the circumcision had been one of the three elect witnesses.* It left upon his intellect and conscience a mark never effaced; it stirred up and refreshed in his heart the hope he never could lose—*the* hope of the Church—the same Lord's second Advent, His "power and coming" in "His majesty," to be glorified in His saints, and admired, not merely by three taken apart, but by all them that believe. Of this splendid visible prophecy of His second Advent the apostle has just said, in the verses before the text, he was one of the "eye-witnesses; for He received honour and glory, when there came such a voice to Him from the excellent glory, This is My beloved Son in Whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with Him in the holy mount. We have also," he then goes on to say, "a more sure word of prophecy, to which ye are doing well in taking heed, as unto a shining lantern in an obscure place until the day increase, and the Day-star arise in your hearts."

I.

St. Peter means, I believe, by "the more firm prophetic word" what St. Paul means in the eucharistic Epistle of this week by "whatsoever things were written aforetime." Each of them was uttering a

* St. Mark ix. 1.

synonym for the entirety of the sacred writings which constituted in their age the whole Bible. Each meant the Old Testament. St. Paul, as the Apostle of the Nations, writing to a Gentile Church of such future world-wide importance as the Church of Rome, says the Old Testament was "written for *our* learning," and "that *we* might have the hope." This great Jew identifies himself with us of the Nations. He asserts, in the teeth of the Jews and Judaizers, that the Old Testament belongs as much to Romans, to Greeks, or to Englishmen as it belongs to Jews. "The hope" shining through and through its pages is the hope of all the nations. The word "Gentiles" or "Nations" occurs no less than six times, you will find, in the week's Epistle.

St. Peter, on the other hand, the Apostle of the Circumcised (whose great name the Judaisers in the Corinthian Church had usurped as that of an apostle opposed in doctrine to St. Paul, and one of whose ends in writing this letter is to declare the complete harmony of St. Paul's doctrine and his own), calls the Old Testament "the firmer word," "the more sure word."* He thus puts himself into the intellectual and moral position of the Jew and the Judaiser. The cry of the Jews and the Judaizers was in the first century, as in this, "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible! We cannot do with this, we cannot accept this, because we do

* I have assumed that the second Epistle of St. Peter is not the pious forgery of a later eirenical writer (i. 1; iii. 15, 16).

not find it in the sacred word." For the Jew, and for the half-jewish Christian, the testimony of the Transfiguration, just cited by their apostle, was not firm and sure enough. The testimony of the Father to the Son was not firm and sure enough. The testimony of the Holy Ghost, outside the Bible, in the hearts of Jew and of Gentile was not firm and sure enough. The testimony of the apostles, as elect witnesses of the glory and the claims of the Son, was not firm and sure enough. The testimony of the Church, the mystical body of the Son and His living representative on earth, was not firm and sure enough. The Jew cried, "To the law and to the testimony." He must have the voice of the Father, the self-manifestation of the Son, the light of the Spirit, the gospel of the apostles, the life of the Church, supplemented, substantiated, and completed by the testimony of that which alone he had never doubted, which was his test of all truth—"the prophetic word," the Old Testament, the Jewish Bible. About the claim of Jesus to be the Promise made unto the fathers, the Jew had doubts. About the claims of the apostles to be (like the prophets) mouthpieces of the Holy Spirit, he had doubts. About the claims of the old prophets—Moses, Samuel, David, Isaiah, and the rest—he alone had no doubts. The divine wisdom and the tenderness of the aged apostle, "now ready to be offered up," break forth in the words he uses. "To your Bible," he says, "you do well to take heed, as unto a lantern shining

in a dark place until the day dawn." The Jew's Bible, as St. Paul says—setting forth the same truth —was the Jew's schoolmaster to lead the Jew to Christ his perfect Teacher. But, if this be true, all heed and diligence in Bible reading is so much loss and confusion unless it leads and lights the reader to the centre and principle of the Bible; to the authority exterior to the Bible, older than the Bible, higher than the Bible, outlasting the Bible; to that Word Who lives and Who makes alive; to that Head of a Church which was to be the pillar and ground of the truth.

Both the great apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, agree then in this, That the hope of Mankind—both of the Jew and of the Nations—lay in the coming of Jesus Christ. They agree further in this, That His coming was the goal and end toward which the whole Jewish Bible, throughout its long and gradual evolution, had been moving. The spark of hope, kindled within man by the Judging and Redeeming Word the moment man fell, set on fire the sacrifice of Abel, the will of Abraham, the tongue of Moses, the harp of David, the lips of the Prophets, and burned on from age to age until in John the Baptist, the burning and shining lantern, it lighted the pathway to the very feet of the Word Himself—"the True Light," now made Man, and enlightening every man who comes into the world. Then the derived light of the lantern paled before the everlasting underived light of the Sun: the written

and spoken word, the ancient Bible, gave place to the Inspiring and Speaking Word: the book receded, the God-Man came into the foreground: God, Who in times past spake through the words of prophets, uttered the Word which is one with Himself, the co-eternal Son. Both the apostles agree that this is the great characteristic and property of the Old Testament, that it is a book of hope, or rather the Book of "The Hope"—that is, of the Christ Who is to come, Christ the expectation of the circumcised Nation, Christ the desire of all the Nations.

II.

But, you may ask, do not the words of the apostles apply to the whole Bible? Do they not cover the New Testament as well as the Old? In the *letter* they certainly do not. They could not; for there was no written New Testament, as such, when the two great apostles wrote. We cannot be sure that they knew that their own Epistles would make any part of such a book: both of them were dead before all the books which form our New Testament were completed. The only New Testament which St. Peter and St. Paul knew was that which the Lord had made in His own Blood. But in the *spirit* their words must apply to the whole Bible, because they had no doubt that the same Spirit of Truth Who had spoken by the prophets, was speaking by the apostles and evangelists. They declared that the

same Spirit who gave laws by Moses was speaking by the totality of the Church, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

There can be little doubt that when the Catholic Church first kept an Advent season, she applied these words mainly, as the apostle had intended, to the Old Testament. In our day, the Old Testament has become so much more the book of the Church—a book claimed as their own by all the Christian nations—than the book of the Jews, that it is hard for us to realize that there was a time when it was the arsenal of the most threatening weapons aimed against the Church. She had to maintain and fight hard for her right to it. The Jews said, "This collection of Law, Prophets, Histories, and Psalms is our Book; it does not belong to you heathen." As the philosophers assaulted the Church with reason, as the pagans assaulted her with their ancient native traditions, so the Jews assaulted her with the Bible written by their forefathers. As the primitive doctors opposed to the philosophers the eternal and uncreated Reason who had become Man, as they opposed to the heathen the original human tradition of the Trinity which they supposed to survive in their distorted traditions of gods, so they opposed to the Jews the Spirit and the Hope of their own written Word. The Person Whom the prophets had trained the circumcised nation to expect as "The Consolation of Israel," they had as strongly asserted to be the "Desire of all Nations."

The Old Testament was not of more importance to the Church in the first ages than it is in our own age (for the word of prophecy must have an ever-increasing importance as the Day approaches): but it had another kind of importance. It was then a sword with which she fought her most bitter opponents and persecutors—the Jews; it is now a trowel with which, without a thought of the Jews, she builds up her houses. The cry of the old Jews against apostolic authority, apostolic doctrine, the universality and nationality of the apostolic gospel, was fundamentally the same cry as that which the Church now hears raised against her by the very newest of Protestant sects. She had to shew the Jew, as she has to shew the Dissenter, that the Bible everywhere bears witness to the higher authority of the Bible Inspirer; that the sacred letter implies the Spirit Who is above the letter; that the written and created word testifies to the Ever-living, Uncreated Word; that all the prophets speak for and of The Prophet; that the law prepares for the Lawgiver and Law-fulfiller. She had to bear witness against the Jews that the Bible was the book of hope for the Nations, and not only for the Jews. She had to bear witness that it was a book of despair for the Jews if they refused to enter into that human and catholic Fellowship which the Father has founded in the Body of Him in Whom the Jews and the nations *are* one. The Jewish doctors might quote texts here, texts there, texts everywhere, to prove

that the assertions of the Church were unscriptural. "Does not the Bible say men must be circumcised? Does it not say they must keep the Sabbath and new moons? Does it not say they must make distinction of meats? Does it not tell them that everyone is cursed who hangeth on the tree? How dare you pretenders to authority tell the Nations that God has made them free from these obligations? How dare you preach the disgraceful *Cross* of Jesus of Nazareth as their hope and glory?"

But Christ was not building up His House upon texts out of a book — even out of the best of books. He did not come to found a new Religion, to add one more to the number of book-revelations. His kingdom was not to stand, like Buddha's or Mohammed's or Joe Smith's, upon a book.* By the acceptance which the good news spread abroad by His Church found in the intellect and heart and conscience of the nations, He testified that the same Spirit Who had spoken by His prophets to the Jews was speaking by His apostles and evangelists to Greeks, Romans, and Syrians; that the same Spirit would continue to speak with His Church to Romans, to Franks, to Englishmen, to Russians; that His Spirit did not complete the Bible, and then leave a group of Hebrew and Greek books to mankind as the substitute for Himself; but that He, the

* I did not foresee in 1868, that Prof. Max Müller would make so contrary an application of the fact of the possession of sacred books by the Church and the Religions in his Mission Lecture in 1873.

Truth, abides with mankind, and testifies to His abiding in the unity of the Christian consciousness and by the daily and ordinary activities of the Church. The Church is the living continuation of the Bible. "Ye," says St. Paul to the Church, "are manifestly declared to be the Epistle of Christ." The Jewish teachers who staked everything upon Holy Writ, who claimed a purely scriptural stand-point, who had no cry but "The Bible, and the Bible only," lost their first claim to the Bible itself; and the Catholic Church, which they tried to destroy by the Bible, became the witness and keeper of Holy Writ. Does a hostile critic of the Old Testament in our time think that he is attacking Judaism? No; he believes that he is doing more hurt to the Christian Church. The prophetic words addressed by the Apostle of the Nations to a Church of Europeans—and read to-day as the eucharistic Epistle at every altar in Western Europe—receive their fulfilment in every heathen baptized into the Catholic Society; "*Whatsoever things were written aforetime* were written for *our* learning, that *we* (Gentiles), through patience and comfort of the Scriptures (given to the Jews and through Jews), might have hope"—not merely hopefulness, but *the* definite "Hope;" the hope of the Old Testament, now almost dead and lost amongst the mass of the children of that Testament. The hope of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the hope of David and the Prophets, the hope of the Baptist and of Simeon, is revealed and vindicated in Him Who gives His Body and Blood at the Christian altar.

III.

The Old Testament and the New, the prophetic word and the evangelical word, the things written aforetime and the things then in process of writing by apostles and evangelists, came at last to form *one Book*—the Holy Bible—*in the Church*. In Christendom the Jews and the Nations became one people, or rather discovered that they were one Catholic Humanity. Out of the conflicts between these two naturally opposing elements in the universal Kingdom of Grace, arose the need of the Four Lives of the common Lord of Jew, Roman, and Greek. The different letters sent by the apostles to different churches in the Church had their origin mainly from this conflict. To the greatest church of all after Jerusalem—the church of Antioch, the mother of national Christendom —there is no epistle. As every book of the Old Testament was written to meet some pressing need of the Jewish people, and owes its existence to the pre-existing chosen and circumcised people, so every book of the New Testament was written to meet some immediate need of the Catholic Church or of some particular church, and owes its existence to the pre-existing baptized society. The very first prerequisite to the proper use and understanding of the Bible is the recollection that it is posterior to the Church. Since it was by men already members of the Church that the Holy Ghost created the Bible, we may say

that the Bible is really the creation and handiwork of the Church. The Church has not grown (like the sects) out of the Bible, or out of the study of the Bible; but the Bible itself grew out of the Church. The Holy Spirit not only made the Holy Scripture *for* the Holy Church, but He made it *by* the Holy Church.

It will clear our minds of much mist if we realize the true contrast between these two great works of the Spirit of Jesus Christ. His work in making the Bible was a passing work; it is now for ever over. He has given the Bible into the hands of the Church as its proper witness and keeper that she may retain it and use it "until" a certain day, as "a lantern that shineth in a dark place." The office of the Bible is a temporary office. Being the lantern, and not the uncreated Light, its use must be continued, the apostle says, "*until* the Day dawn, and the Light-bearer arises in our hearts." The Day, the glorious coming or full revelation of the unkindled and self-contained Source of Light, will necessarily end all use or need of the kindled and created light. When the sun has arisen, the lantern—so precious and inestimable in the night and dawn—ceases, even though its flame is still unextinguished, to give any guiding light.

The work of the Holy Ghost in making and in making perfect the Church is, on the contrary, a permanent work. The Church will not cease when the Bible ceases to be needed (by the Advent of Christ the Light) as a lantern to her feet. The

lantern loses its use and the end of its being by the advent of the sun, but the user of the lantern during the dark and dawn continues the same during the day. The lantern is the servant and creature of the man—a servant indeed which he must have and must use; but the man is not the servant and creature of the lantern.

The apostle's language is parabolic. He sets us thinking of the written word as the Church's lantern, but of the Eternal Word as the Church's Light. The lantern guides a man in the dangers and deceits of the dark: it enables him to carry on the studies and vigils of the night: it leads him by the straight path in the fulfilling of the charities of the night: it cheers him amid the brain-spectres, the weird fears, the gaunt misshapen shadows, the real-looking unrealities which haunt his imagination in the time before the day dawns and the Light-bringer arises. It gives him *hope* while it gives him light. Christ, the Coming Day and Sun, is the hope of man's kind. Our lantern, the Bible, gives us a true image, although it does not itself bring to us the perfect and visible presence, of Jesus our Hope and our Light. He alone (our true Day, true Sun, true Noon, our *Phosphor* "Light-bringer," as St. Peter has it), brings us light when He Himself makes a real advent to us. Thus, even now, "the Light of life" to which the Bible directs and leads us, but which it does not itself give us, Jesus Himself does give us in His sacraments. I shall speak of this presently. But

His whole Light—His Noon—He reserves until "the Day," "the Day of the Lord," that great "Sun-day." Whatever light we now have—the clearing of our reason, the liberation of our conscience, the proper direction of our will—is ours through His incarnation, that is, His enlightening of every man who comes into the world. Wherever "the true Light" is, there Jesus Christ has come. It is the Church's vocation to declare to men the Source of their enlightenment. The Church exists "to bear witness to the Light."

IV.

Whenever "we do well," as the apostle says, whenever we "take heed" to the shining lantern of the Holy Scriptures—whenever we hear them, read them, mark them, learn them, inwardly digest them—let it be according to the counsel of this scripture-writer. Let us not put the lantern which God has given us into the place of the Light, which is God. Many a man says, "I take my theology and my religion out of the Bible." Do you? Then it is sure to be your theology and your religion: it is not sure to be the Bible's theology and the Bible's religion. A writer in the Bible told the Christians to whom he sent his short letter, and the Bible therefore now tells us as Christians, to "contend earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the saints." But he did not tell them, nor does the Bible tell us, what that Faith is. He implies, and the Bible implies, that those who are in the

Church are in possession of it, and are bound to apply it. The apostolical letters do not so much deal with this Faith as with the application of it to the contemporary needs of churches and persons.

The Bible was given for people of all tongues. The words, "the faith once delivered," have only to be latinized and they stand as "the traditional faith." Nay, the very Bible itself is in great part a collection of traditions. St. Luke, in the first chapter of his Gospel, gives this very name to the material out of which he and his fellow-evangelists compiled their gospels. A faith without traditions is like a science without traditions. Each man who approaches it must begin afresh; he must ignore, not merely all the mistakes, but all the conquests and true experiences of those who have studied and developed that science. A society without traditions, whether a church or a nation, is as yet nothing but an experiment. It is the business of a true teacher in the Church, as of a true statesman or historian in the Nation, to distinguish between the true and false traditions of his society. Scripture and Tradition are glibly talked of as two rivals. But is there one single sect which has originally grown out of quarrel with the tradition of the Church which is not now glorying in its own traditions? You remember the Bicentenary of 1662, when the Independents made so much literary and pulpit stir about the ejection of the Nonconformist intruders from the English parishes. The movement was a glorification of traditions; but the movers have

not yet settled what the true tradition is, or who are its proper heirs. The Independents and Baptists claim the old Presbyterian believers in ecclesiastical establishments as the fathers of the Liberation Society. The Unitarians claim the fierce Calvinistic pastors who consented by something more than silence to the imprisonment of John Biddle, and who filled English gaols with Quaker confessors, as the fathers of freedom of religious thought. Every founder of a sect which promises any length of life, little as he intends it, must become the originator of a new series of traditions.

I believe, indeed, that the providence of the Head of the Church has maintained Independency as a witness to a primitive tradition of the Church. The Congregationalists have borne a splendid witness, at bitter cost, to the place and the rights of the whole congregation of the Lord. Christ's holy congregation is silenced in the National Church in the interest of its patron and its incumbent. Priests who are loud in demanding from the bishops a fuller liberty for the presbytery, never dream that the congregations have an equally divine title to demand liberty for themselves. The apostle says to the whole Church, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." It is a modern theory that the beneficed priest alone ought to be a law to himself and to his church, that the bishop is the only tyrant, and the congregation the only rebel. It is thought right that the diocesan Church with the

bishop as ruler should be brought within the lines of civilized communities and become a constitutional society, but that the congregational Church with the parish priest as its ruler should remain a pure autocracy: the diocese is to be a Church, but the parish is to be a popedom. Those fancy pictures in which the freedom of the national priest is contrasted with the bondage of the independent or baptist pastor are painted at the order of the trades-union of patrons and incumbents, which is called, I believe, "The Church Defence Society." The artists assume that no priests are of any count in the Church unless they are beneficed. It requires a whole congregation to dismiss the independent or baptist preacher: the curate of the Nation's Church may be turned adrift at one man's will.

I believe also that the Lord has maintained Presbyterianism as a standing witness to a pure tradition of the Church, to the place and the rights of the second order of the ministry. But it is monstrous to suppose that the priests can claim a place by the bishop as his fellow-rulers, and at the same time be autocratic rulers of the congregations. It is impudent to claim a right to elect their bishop, and at the same time refuse the congregations the right to elect their pastor. I believe also that the Lord has maintained many a form of so-called liberal Christianity as a witness to the original tradition of the Church that He has poured out an inquiring and examining Spirit on our race, and that a man is called

by his baptism to be a thinker, and not simply to be thought for and directed by his teachers. But these are scarcely among the traditions which the ejected preachers of 1662 delivered to their children. They were men who despaired of the real or historical Church. For the ancient faith, "I believe in the Catholic Church," they substituted, "I believe there will be a Catholic Church as soon as we can make one." Instead of abiding in the existing communion, and striving to bring back their own mother to her own traditions, they set up rival communions and made modern caricatures of those traditions. A biblical theologian can no more regard either of these communions as "the Church," than a scientific historian can regard the English tailors of Tooley Street as the English Nation. Every sect which continues any length of time in being, grants at last that its founder took a false position. The founder gave his new sect the catholic name of "The Church:" his successors are content to call the same sect "one of the churches."

I believe that few persons of an unhistorical consciousness can sit down to study the Bible independently of the Church without ending by a desire to construct a new church.* There is the same difference between the actual Church of flesh and blood

* The Dean of Westminster, in his thrice-used essay on "Ultramontanism" (in which he implicitly defines Ultramontanism as neither more nor less than Anti-Arnoldism), aptly remarks, that for educated men, who take a serious view of Christendom as a whole, the notion of forming a new sect no longer commends itself. A newspaper corre-

and the glorious ideal of the Church which her earliest authors had before their minds, as there is between the actual England of flesh and blood and that ideal England which law-makers and political economists, or the poets of national songs, have before their mind. The living Church confesses every day to God, "We have departed from Thy way." No charge can be brought against the Church more severe than that which the Church brings against herself. A novel Church needs no other condemnation than the self-satisfied proclamation of its architects that they have founded it upon the New Testament; for it cannot in that case be the Church of the Bible, which was founded upon the mediation of the Godhead and Manhood in Jesus Christ before a single line of the New Testament was written. Every sect founded upon chapters and verses, or rather on a particular age's or a particular man's conceptions of chapters and verses, may present some fair lineaments of likeness to the Church of the apostolic age. It may be a tolerably faithful picture of the Church as it then was; at all events it may be a fair representation of a serious and earnest student's conception of the past character of the Church. But still a picture is one thing, the substance it depicts is quite another

spondent asked Mrs. Girling, the Shakers' Mother, "Did the doctrine and practice of her people differ from those of the American Shakers?" Yes; she was the founder of the sect, and the name she claimed for it was *Bible-Christians*. This faith was founded *wholly on the Bible*. Since the revelation to her, she read no other book, and wanted none."—*Times*, Dec. 26, 1874.

thing. If some of us were to agree to strip ourselves of half the gains of our civilisation, we might represent the English Nation in the time of the Norman Conquest; and if we were to strip ourselves still more, we might represent the still more primitive English Nation of the time of Hengest. But we could not pretend, on that account, to constitute the whole and the only English Nation in this age.

The Bible is still, as in St. Peter's time, the lantern of an already existing Church. Woe to the Church if she makes no enlightening use of it. But the Church no more needs the Bible in order to be the Church, than a man needs a lamp or the gas in order to be a man. The Church needs the Bible in order that she may always, as the apostle says, "have hope." She needs the Bible "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." She needs the Bible for "a more sure prophetic word;" just as a man needs a lantern or the gaslight, before the day has risen, in order that he may walk straightly, avoid pitfalls, or pursue the study or labour which his calling demands of him. The Bible shews the already existing Church how she "ought to walk and to please God." It does not pretend to shew men how to make the church.

Before the New Testament was written, He who is the Head and Foundation of the Church elected and fitted men to be the formers of the Church. He gave them the whole Humankind, "all Nations" and "every creature" united to God in Him and quickened by

His Spirit as the material; He gave them the gospel and the sacraments as the instruments for forming and maintaining it. "Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Whithersoever the apostles went with the word and with baptism, there they found the incarnate Word already present before them. They found the Church-informing Spirit awaiting them in the conscience and intellect of men. They found the Catholic Church already existing implicitly in the divine order which holds and moulds the Humankind as one in spite of all its divisions. They found the National Churches already existing implicitly in the Nations into which Christ marks off the humankind by His providence in history. They brought the implicit Church into the beginning of actual existence by the publication of God's message and the use of the sacrament of new birth.

V.

Many persons who remain in the universal communion once for all established, who have no wish to found any other in its stead, are heard to declare, "We take our doctrine of the Sacraments from the Bible." The Sacraments have this in common with the Church, that they are earlier and older than the Bible.

Circumcision is older than the books of Genesis and Exodus; Baptism and the Eucharist are older than the Gospels and the Epistles. We may grievously misunderstand the Sacraments if we think we can only understand them by collecting and studying all that is said about them in the Bible. Think how the Anabaptists and the Tridentine Fathers alike sat down to this study, and see to what small degree of unity of belief they came although the matter of their examination was so simple and so unquestioned. Each started with a bias. So each founder of a sect or finder of an interpretation starts also with a bias, either inherited or reactionary.

We are most likely rightly to understand the Bible when we read it by the light cast upon it by the unchanged and unchangeable Sacraments. Each line of the New Testament was written by baptized men, each phrase of it was thought out by men who were in the habit of receiving the Eucharist. Baptism and the Eucharist are independent of languages. What they teach in one place they teach in all. St. Paul spoke of the meaning and the celebration of the Eucharist as traditions which he had delivered to the Corinthian Church.* He recalled the divided community to the eucharistic tradition which they had already received. He repeated in writing what he had taught earlier by mouth. The Sacraments and the Church come continually and afresh in the present time to each one of us immediately from

* 1 Cor. xi. 23.

Christ the Eternal Word; the Bible comes to us from Him mediately through the persons by whom He gave it, the last of whom received the very latest part of it eighteen centuries ago. We cannot understand the Sacraments and the proper use of them apart from the historical doctrine of them which has been preserved by the consciousness of the Church in applying them to "all nations" and "every creature." The light which is in them by the presence of Christ in them has no doubt cleared many a simple mind which had been darkened by its own study of the Bible, or by the foolish and opinionative words of revered teachers. In a certain country town the parish priest some years ago was a Calvinist in opinion. I do not think he dared so to alter the lesson as to read, "God so loved the elect that He gave His only begotten Son that not one of the elect who believed in Him should perish." But he said that very few of the elect lived in his town: he virtually taught the majority of his hearers in his sermons that Christ's blood had not been shed for them. Christ Himself, however, had taken care that His own Sacrament of Baptism, as preserved and used in His Church, should preach to the same persons by the mouth of the same priest His own gospel. He was obliged to preach at the font the gospel which he denied in the pulpit. There he was obliged to say to each common sharer of Christ's flesh and blood, "Thou art the child of God, thou art the member of Christ." The World's Redeemer has taken

care, "until He come," that His Sacrament of the Eucharist shall go on preaching glad tidings to men, even although the minister of the Eucharist may be preaching evil tidings. In the pulpit he may deliver his own pharisaical word. At the altar he must deliver God's evangelical word, "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, *which was shed for thee*, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful."

The most practical turn we can give to the apostle's words is to turn them into a question for our consciences. Do we indeed "do well," that is, do we indeed "take heed to this lantern shining in a dark place"? The more there is of light in our churchmanship, the more reason and conscience there is in it, the more we make the Sacraments and the Divine Light in them the test and measure of our churchmanship, so much the more we shall be obliged to "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest" the Bible. It is a sickly churchmanship which half trembles at or half nauseates the Bible, which turns in preference to books of devotion, to gushing hymns, to ascetic treatises. If it will not endure the lantern, how much less will it endure the coming Daylight. Out of ascetic treatises, out of manuals of devotion, out of experimental hymns, we may often draw great good. But do they hold out to men above all else the human "hope"? Do they not as often lead us into a mild despair? Do they not speak of ecstacies

which we never feel? They may bear the precious impress of some individual sanctified spirit. They do not bear, as the Bible does, the impress of the universal sanctifying Spirit. We are creatures "saved by hope." We are degraded, lowered, damned by despair. The Bible, as we declare in our Collect, is beyond all else the book of Hope. In it the Holy Ghost has enshrined the most precious jewel, Hope. It was written by men full of hope for their Nation, full of hope for Humanity. It speaks to us as no other book can, no other words can, of The Hope—the Appearance to all men of mankind's Saviour. We misread the Bible until we see in the light which this lantern casts upon our dark paths a hopeful light for ourselves for every creature of whom the old man in us despairs, and for all our kind.

VII.

THE SON OF MAN REVEALING HIMSELF TO HIS CHURCH AS A THIEF.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT. DECEMBER 20, 1874.

S. LUKE xii. 39—41.

"And this know, that if the good man of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. Be ye therefore ready also: for the Son of Man cometh at an hour when ye think not. Then Peter said unto Him, Lord, speakest Thou this parable unto us, or even to all?"

WHEN St. Paul wrote to the divided Church of Corinth to recall its members to that unity which was underlying their fierce party divisions, he began by setting before the Corinthian Christians their right attitude as a Church. "Waiting," he said, "for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who shall also confirm you to the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." The idea of the Church as a household or fellowship of servants waiting for the appearance of their Master, is frequently reproduced in the apostolical letters. But it did not originate with the apostles. It is one which the Master Himself had set before them as a parable

of the kingdom of heaven. It appears under various aspects in the series of short parables in the Advent discourse of the Lord from which the text is taken —a discourse related with some differences by each of the three first evangelists.

The time of this advent sermon is placed by St. Matthew and St. Mark in the last week of the Lord's life, after His most solemn public advent into Jerusalem. The Mount of Olives, with the Temple of God in sight, is made by them the scene of it. The cause of it was a question which the apostles "Peter and James, and John and Andrew," asked Him "privately" as He sat looking down upon the holy city. "Tell us when shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of Thy appearing, and of the ending of the age?"

The text forms part of an ancient Holy Gospel for the festivals of "One Confessor."* It is, therefore, an expression of the Church's idea of a confessor as a servant in Christ's house, ready and prepared for the appearance of his Master at any hour. In an earlier parable of the series, immediately before the text, Jesus represents Himself as a Lord returning home from His wedding, and the Church as His household of servants, uncertain at what hour He will appear, but watching patiently and wakefully within the house to open the door as soon as their Lord shall

* Commune unius Confessoris. See D. Radulphi Ardentis Pictavi *Homiliæ* (II. xxiv. De Sanctis, pp. 1585, 1586. Ed. Migne). It is still in use for the "Common of a Confessor not a Bishop," in the Roman Breviary.

knock. The image is one with which we are familiar. But elsewhere the Lord has represented the wedding as taking place after His appearing, and His servants as called to share in its celebration. In this parable, however, the Bridegroom appears to the waiting servants after the wedding; He gives them a feast, and their Master Himself waits upon them as their minister.

I.

In the parable of the text, our Blessed Lord represents Himself as a thief. Startling as this strange choice must have been to His disciples at the time, I imagine that they began to discern something of its appropriateness when they saw or heard of His acceptance of the thief at His last hour upon the cross. For, after all, what is a thief? Is he not *a man?* The splendid faculties which often run to waste or to wild misuse in a thief —the fertility of invention, the alert readiness, the daring risk of life—are capable of splendid uses. They are good, whatever bad use may be made of them. They are gifts of the Father to that Son of Man Who is the Head of every man. Perhaps they have sought outlet in crime because a selfish and possibly thievish society, by the disorder and anarchy which it dares to call order, has closed nearly all honest outlets for them, has not taken care that every one of its members shall receive the best possible education and hope of free humane development,

to which each has a divine right by his birth and redemption. The majority of thieves, whether instructed or uninstructed, are men in whom the Humanity has not been educated.

The mass of the priests of the Son of Man in almost all nations are now squabbling about something which they call "religious education," instead of devoting themselves to the actual culture of the Humanity of their fellow-citizens, the education of the fathers and mothers of the children? We are not unnaturally accused of trying to secure the schooling of the children because we feel ourselves utterly incapable of educating the parents, who are the children's divinely appointed educators. Yet it is not wholly just. If the clergy, as an order, have been half afraid of culture, the men who have cared most to impart it to their brethren have been clergymen. But when the Lord ordained His apostles and clergy to be educators of "all nations" and "every creature," He said nothing of schools. The Church's work as a teacher was then being helped by the noble schools of Jewry and of Heathendom, in which certainly no Christian schooling was being given. In his own antichristian or præ-christian schooling as Saul of Tarsus, which the Christian Apostle sums up as "the law," he subsequently saw a "schoolmaster" which had been leading him to Christ, and unconsciously preparing him for the hour in which it pleased the Father to reveal His Son in the fiery pharisee. If His Son be in men

now as He was in the unbelieving and bitter Saul in the first century, no kind of schooling can hinder His revelation in His own hour.

The education committed to us as teachers of all Nations is the educing—the *leading out* into light and free activity—of the child of God which lies buried but not dead in each of the children of men, the nature of the new Adam which lies dormant, but yet alive, under the old Adam. We are ordained to bear witness unto the Christ Who is enlightening every man who comes into the world. Education is the nurture and culture of that new life and birth which is in Humanity through the mediation of the incarnate Son of God. Education is a struggle of grace against nature, of the spirit against the flesh. We see this in every page of that Old Testament which shews us God busy at the education of mankind, of nations, and of persons, but resisted at every step by His scholars. All those in this Church who are parents or teachers have already had the lesson set before them (though they may not yet have learned it) that culture or education is not as natural to the child as growth is, as eating is, or as playing is. If the spirit desires to learn, the flesh lusts to play and not learn. If the spirit longs to rise to Humanity, the flesh lusts to lie grovelling below it. You may see the history of the redemption and wandering of the tribes, of the law-giving and law-breaking, of Exodus and Numbers, reproduced in little in the children at your

knee. You may see that the same Christ is with them Who was with the liberated slaves in the wilderness.

A thief, I say, is one who ought to have been educated into a man. There *is* a man beneath the thief in every housebreaker. We may be unable to reach this child of God, to raise him from the dead, to lead him forth to newness of life. But the Father of all, Who raised up His Son Jesus, can raise him. The Son of God shewed on His cross that He could and can reach the man in the thief, the believer in the scoffer, the penitent in the malefactor. When one who should have been a man in society becomes through society's fault an enemy to it—a thief instead of a man—then the Son of Man comes unexpectedly to judgment upon society. He reveals Himself suddenly as a thief in the night to that society. Its house is broken through by Jesus Christ, as the house of Christian France was broken through at the close of the eighteenth century, because it has not "watched." Our blessed Lord, in representing Himself as a thief, and His advent to judgment as a housebreaking, does not call Himself the Son of God or the Judge. He makes use of His all-including Human name, the title which bears witness to the kinship of each thief as well as each judge to Him—the Son of Man. "Be ye therefore ready," He says to His apostles and clergy, "for the Son of Man cometh at such an hour as ye think not."

II.

Does not the conscience of Christian society bear witness in a great crisis or day of judgment that it is the Son of Man, Jesus the incarnate Righteousness of God, Who has appeared? Men give two different names to the terrible events, the fearful housebreakings of the house of civil society and the house of ecclesiastical society, which occur in their own time, and from which they suffer. Some men see nothing and speak of nothing but the wicked destruction of property, the sudden dissolution of moral restraint, the reckless breaking through of all safeguards and defences by thievish revolutionists or communists, or by a victorious foreign soldiery in their land. Other men, or perhaps the same men at other times, see The Judge's presence in their society, and speak of all the horrors which are going around them as the manifest judgments of God. Some men speak of all evil and misery as simply the acts of the vile and evil; others speak of the same evil and misery as the action in some way of the good and righteous God. Does not the Judge of the Church and the nations tell us by His parable that there is no contradiction in such apparently contradictory language? There is thievery and spoliation. The thieves may use finer names for their acts. But these are the true names for them. The house of the Church is broken through

by thieves. The house of society is broken through by thieves. The Son of Man has come like a thief.

But why has all civil and ecclesiastical order come to this horrible wreck and dislocation? The steward of the house has not "watched." He has not expected the appearance of the thief. He has not known at what hour the thief would come. He has said, *Après moi, le déluge.* He has not cared, as the Judge says in the later part of this same discourse, to "discern this time." He has least of all expected that the Housebreaker and the true Lord of the house, Who made him its steward, will prove to be one and the same. "Behold," God said by the priest Ezekiel, "I will profane My sanctuary." The same awful group of events which the owner calls thieving and housebreaking, the Lord and Owner of all calls by the same names. He is the Owner of Humanity as well as of human property; He is the owner of the poor men whom faithless want of watching has made thieves, as well as of greater men who steal commons and forests, and send lesser thieves to prison. He does not deny robbery to be robbery, or housebreaking to be housebreaking; but He declares that these, and whatever other names of horror we can utter, are only the superficial and secular names for the outward and seen signs of His day of judgment. The Lord and King of all shews us by this parable their inward name and eternal significance. They are His advents

to the judgment of that society which has made men into thieves. They are signs of the dreadful Self-discovery of Him Who is outraged in every outrage of Humanity, Who is neglected in all neglect of Humanity, Who cares for the honesty and justice of each creature, poor or rich. The thief is the Son of Man. The housebreaker is the Word of the Father, of Whom every household in heaven and earth is named.

We find plentiful evidences in the apostolical letters of the deep impression which the Lord's comparison of His coming to the coming of a thief, and His parable of the sudden and expected revelation of the kingdom of heaven in the earth to the unexpected revelation of a housebreaker, made upon the minds of His apostles. The evangelists not improbably remembered it, when they related the scene which took place in Gethsemane later in this same week, and the speech of the Lord to the agents of the religious world, "the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and the elders," who had come suddenly to seize Him: "Are ye come out as against a thief, with swords and staves, for to take Me?"

The Word of the Father was no doubt a thief in the estimation of the leaders of the worldly religious parties. He was not the kind of Christ whom their lusts demanded or their interests needed. They regarded Him as an abettor and misleader of the dangerous classes in which

possible revolutions and housebreakings are only dormant. Jesus had robbed men, in their opinion, of more precious things than houses and goods. He had robbed them of their docile submission to party directors, and of their unquestioning acceptance of the latest novelties which the leaders of the sects pleased to call the traditions of the fathers. But, even in His own sense of the parable, the Son of Man had appeared to Israel's rulers and teachers as a thief. It seemed to them to be the hour in which they were punishing Him. But it was the hour of His spoliation of the once-glorious household of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, which the Lord had intrusted to them as His ministers and stewards. The servants of the Old Testament household should have been watching and caring for the coming of the King Who was to be the consolation of the lowest and most wretched in the Nation; but they were attending to nothing but their own carnal or religious interests, their worldly or other-worldly lusts. Instead of acting as the Lord's faithful and wise stewards, giving to each his meat in due season, they were despising and ill-using their fellow-servants. While the Lord was speaking His parable, seated on the Mount of Olives, His own eyes and the eyes of His hearers were resting upon the splendid city of God below them, with its temple and its mighty walls, apparently so stable and secure. Because its stewards refused to use it as God's "House of prayer for all Nations," as His

centre of "blessing to all the Families of the earth," therefore His Son was about to break in upon it as a thief in the night.

III.

The moment the Lord had so strangely likened Himself to a thief, before He could continue His discourse, one at least of the apostles (as St. Luke alone tells us) was troubled at it. It is not improbable that all were perplexed and amazed, and that St. Peter spoke for all. "Who are the *ye*," they asked themselves, "whom the Son of Man bids to be ready for His coming as a thief? What is the house, and who is the keeper of the house, in which the Son of Man will, at an unexpected hour, appear as the housebreaker?" They must have soon perceived that the house was not merely that house of God then lifting up itself in their sight, in which the Son of Man had so lately suddenly appeared as a thief, making a revolutionary wreck of the property of the money-changers. The apostles knew that the Lord had called them to be stewards of His household, ministers of their meat in due season to their fellow-servants. They must soon have perceived that they were the good-men of the house; that the holy Apostolic Church was the house of which He mainly spoke. But did He also mean, they asked themselves, other households and other keepers? "Then said Peter unto Him, Lord, speakest Thou this parable unto us, or even to all?"

In the short parables which follow St. Peter's question, I imagine that our blessed Lord gave His answer to that question. It will be impossible to cite them all. I shall only so far touch upon them as they help to throw light upon this parable of the revelation of the Lord and Owner of all as a thief.

The Son of Man will not come as a thief to that servant (in a church, a nation, or a family) whom He finds acting as a faithful and wise steward. He will not take anything from that servant. On the contrary, He will give that servant a share of His own authority; He will give him real power over human hearts and consciences. Jesus declares that He will make him a ruler over all that He hath.* But the Son of Man will come as a thief to that servant in any of His households who is living as if he were its absolute lord and not its steward; who shall begin to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken.† It will be no good for him to assert in the hour of the appearance of the Head of the Church and the Head of every man, that he has been catholic and apostolic. The Lord "will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers"—to whom he fundamentally belongs.‡ At the Lord's coming the ignorant servant will be beaten with few stripes; but the servant who knew His Lord's will and did it not, will be beaten with many stripes.§

* *vv.* 42—44. † *vv.* 45, 46. ‡ S. Matt. xxiv. 48.
§ *vv.* 47, 48.

In the next short parable of this Advent series our blessed Lord warned His apostles and warns His clergy against thinking of His revelation as the thief and housebreaker as an event vaguely distant and afar off.* "The Lord," we have heard in to-day's Epistle, "is at hand." So the apostle of the Nations wrote to the Church of Philippi. "The Lord is at hand" the clergy say year after year on this day to the national Churches of Christendom. The flaming fire of His judgment could not be nearer to His stewards and His households than it is. It is kept ready to be revealed. Between us and it there is nothing but the thinnest veil, which may be rent at any unexpected instant. He urges us to "be also ready;" to be so ready. The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; it is His household in which men are stewards. The Lord of the earth says in this discourse: "I am come to send fire on the earth, and what will I if it be already kindled?" His fire is indeed a fire in which the Son of Man will be present with us, through which He has passed before us. If destruction is its process, salvation is the end of its process; for He goes on to say, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened until it be accomplished!" He was then and there revealing Himself in the household of Jewish society as a housebreaker and a factor of fiery conflagration. The same Lord is here and now "at hand." He is always ready to appear,

* *vv.* 49, 50.

at an hour when the careless stewards look not for Him, as a housebreaker and a kindler of conflagration in the household of the English Church, or the household of English society, or in any modern household of which He is the Lord. "Suppose ye," He goes on to say to His apostles and clergy, "that I am come to send peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather divisions; for from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three."*

In every household of God, whether a civil society or an ecclesiastical society, there will be on one side those who are for the Son of Man and for Humanity. There will be those on the other side who are for self, or for their class or their party. Nay more: these are the divisions which He manifests as fundamental and decisive in the totality of mankind as one household. The Father has divided Humanity into Nations. At His revelation He will reveal the moral and spiritual division which exists between these Nations. He says in a later part of this discourse, as given by St. Matthew: "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory: and before Him shall be gathered all nations." Humanity will be the test by which the citizens of each nation will be tried. According to their treatment of Himself as Head of every man, as present in the poor and wretched and persecuted, the Son of Man will

* *vv.* 51—53.

separate them from one another. He will own those who took care for the nurture, culture, and liberation of each human creature. He will spoil those who have taken His name upon them in vain; in whose streets He has taught, but who have abused their powers and faculties to the use of Mammon, instead of the Father of all; who have chosen to serve some antichrist, instead of serving the Humanity which is gathered up and represented by that Son of God who comes to judgment as the Son of Man.

IV.

St. Luke tells us that our blessed Lord, before speaking the closing parables of this chapter, turned from the apostles to the people. The Advent discourse began in the hearing of a very small congregation: "As He sat upon the Mount of Olives, His disciples came unto Him privately." So says St. Matthew, who was not one of those who came. St. Mark says that only four apostles were present at the first, of whom his instructor, St. Peter, was one. But during the course of the Lord's conversation, not only other disciples, but a crowd of the people had discovered the place of His rest and privacy. His quiet talk with the four apostles grew into a public sermon.

The Lord's action of turning to the people, which St. Luke alone records, was probably a part of His answer to the question of St. Peter St. Luke reminds

us that Jesus Christ is not merely the Lord of the ecclesiastical household: He is the Lord also of the national household. "Before Him shall be gathered all Nations." He sends His legates or apostles to "all Nations" with His doctrine, because the Nations are His own. "He said also unto the people (literally, "to the crowds"): When ye see a cloud rise out of the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower, and so it is. And when ye see the south wind blow, ye say, There will be heat, and it cometh to pass. Ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how it is that ye do not discern this time? Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?"* The Son of Man calls the crowds of the people as well as the priesthood to be ready against His appearing. Each of their houses—the house of business or the house of the family—is His house. If they do not watch, He will appear in their houses as a thief at some hour in which they look not for Him. He rebukes them because they refuse to examine the moral character of their own time. They will not foresee that their future is indicated by present signs. They acquiesce lazily in the roseate views of it, or the jaundiced views of it, put forward by their directors. They will not use the common judgment which He has given them as men, by which they examine the signs of the physical world, and foresee the future weather indicated by the sky and earth. Where such moral signs are exhibited

* *vv.* 44—57.

in any population as the household of Jerusalem was then exhibiting, it is certain that the Son of Man will appear as the housebreaker at some hour in which the crowds of men are not looking for Him, in the flaming fire which He has kindled, taking vengeance on them that know not God. But who are those "that know not God"? Those inhuman ones who confess not that God is manifest in the Son of Man, the Head and Redeemer of every creature; those who deny (not in their words but in their lives) that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh which paupers share with millionaires, which publicans share with pharisees, which heretics share with catholics. So the Son of Man, the everlasting Redeemer of slaves, came unexpectedly as a thief in the night upon the house of Egypt. So He came upon the house of Babylon. So He came upon the house of Israel. So He came upon Rome. So He came upon Constantinople. So He has twice appeared in flaming fire in Paris. So He may appear in London. His fire is kindled in the earth ready to be revealed; we know not how thin the veil is which is hiding or hindering its revelation.

Yet, my brethren, when I pass from here to London, or go about the streets of our huge city, and see the hopeful schools which are now lifting up their roofs so visibly above the mean houses and streets full of the poor and untaught, I feel that God has poured out the Spirit of His Son upon our English Nation. The Schools of the

Nation seem to me to be signs of a national belief that "the kingdom of God is at hand." Although it may not express its belief in biblical terms, it is bringing forth in its new legislation "worthy fruits of penance." It is discerning that its Judge must soon reveal Himself in it suddenly as a thief and breaker-through of its houses if it does not give His creatures the benefit of the redemption and culture which He has willed for all.

May we not fear that it is to His professed disciples and His ordained clergy, rather than to the people, that He is now saying, "Ye hypocrites (ye *play-actors*), ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time?"* Play-actors the Judge of all the earth may indeed call us, so long as in this most serious *season* of *proving* †—when the crowds are demanding whether they are things or spirits, bundles of molecules or sons and daughters of the Eternal—we are quarrelling what kind of dresses the ordained teachers of the nation shall wear, what postures they shall take, how many inches they shall bow!

I know, indeed, what is said about the eucharistic vestments by those who are debating whether or not they shall cast away the national calling which Christ has given them if the uninstructed nation calls upon them by hasty legislation to give up the vestments. It is said that they are

* *v.* 56.

† τὸν δὲ καιρὸν τοῦτον πῶς οὐ δοκιμάζετε.

not only important because they bear witness to our unity with the contemporary Catholic Church, but because they bear witness to the identity of the present Church of England with the Church of England before the Reformation. These are both important matters indeed. But yet the most important matter now before us is, I think, how we are still to bear witness that we are the national priests in case Christ should appear at some unexpected hour as the thief in this His Anglican household, and should spoil us of our establishment and endowment. What care are we taking to shew English citizens that the Church is in union with the State (which no Protestant or Romish sect can ever be), not because it is an established, but because it is a National Church? What care are we taking to shew that the national vocation of Christ's English clergy is not the result of their establishment, but was originally the cause of it, and that establishment is but a temporal and secular accident of that abiding relation by which Christ has united His Catholic Church to His Nations? It was the most marvellous and persistent feature of the præ-reformation Church of England—as it once was of all the other national churches of Europe—that in spite of the power and the political genius of the Roman bishops it still continued national. St. Augustine found it impossible to make it Roman. St. Gregory the Great prohibited him from making the attempt. But how much of the ritual lately introduced into English churches is really English? How much of it is

simply the expression of the priest's own private likings, or of the opinions of the sacramental confraternity which is his virtual ordinary. To introduce all sorts of vulgar and novel Roman uses, and the dehumanising Jesuit system of "direction," of which the English Church anterior to the Reformation knew nothing at all, are strange modes of shewing identity. Ecclesiastical tailors cannot make us successors of St. Alphege or of Stephen Langton. If our bishops and priests are Englishmen before they are party-members or class-members, if they care more for the utmost enfranchisement and culture of every Englishman in body and soul than for the interests of property or the interests of classes, they will be such successors of Archbishop Langton as no monsignore of the Romish sect, although he wears similar clothes and performs a somewhat similar ritual, can possibly be. When the patriotic primate of England demanded from the disloyal King of England as the first article of the great Charter, *Ecclesia Anglicana libera sit*—Let the English Church be free—the English nation supported his demand for ecclesiastical liberty because it knew that he was not a Roman first and an Englishman afterwards.* The archbishop was more of an Englishman than the

* When Romish controversialists quote Magna Charta they take care to omit the quality and word *Anglicana*. The late Monsignore Goss, the Bishop of the Romanists in Liverpool, delivered a lecture in which he assumed throughout that the Roman Church in England, and not the Church of England, was the Church of the Great Charter, whose article he cited as simply, *Ecclesia libera sit.*

king was. The English State trusted and honoured him because he trusted and honoured the English State. If the English Nation often suspects us as possible foes, as probable agents of English deterioration rather than of English culture, is it not because we have been so eager to shew ourselves upon the side of interests and classes, rather than upon the side of the "flesh and blood" which is summed up in the Son of Man? Is it not because we clergy have preferred rather to hold the brief of Mammon than to bear witness to the Man Who is ready to be revealed as the housebreaker of every house of His which Mammon is using as its own?

All that can be done for a national clergy by ecclesiastical tailors, all that can be done by congregations of rites and ceremonies—whether composed of learned ritualist adepts, as in Rome, or composed of no one knows who, as in England—all that can be done by missions, retreats, multiplied confessions, Jesuit theology, and the Jesuit enslavement of the conscience called direction, was done for the national Church of France during the seventeenth century. But none of it could open the eyes of the keepers of Christ's house in France to the signs of their time. They were saying, Peace and safety. They did not suspect that the Day of the Lord was at hand. When the Son of Man broke through their civil and ecclesiastical households in flaming fire, taking vengeance upon them that would not know God in common Humanity and in Huguenot French brethren,

He appeared at an hour when they looked not for Him, like a thief in the night. As He had revealed Himself in the great patriarchal Churches of the East and of North Africa—the Churches of Origen and Athanasius, of Cyprian and Augustine—by the terrible sword of Islam, so He revealed Himself by the scaffold of the Jacobins in the Church of Pascal and Fenelon. If every individual man is a more sacred person in our age than in any prior ages, it is due to the awful Revelation of the Son of Man as a Thief in the great revolution. "I will make a Man," He said by His ancient prophet, "more precious than fine gold; even a Man than the golden wedge of Ophir. Therefore I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the Lord of hosts and in the day of His fierce anger."

St. Peter's question was asked, and the Lord's answer to it was given, I must again remind you, while the most signal example of the house and city of God stood prominently in view. "One of His disciples," St. Mark tells us, had even called the Lord to look attentively upon it. "Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here? And Jesus answering, said, Seest Thou these great buildings? there shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." In the charges which the glorified Lord gave by His apostle to the primitive churches in Asia Minor this parable reappears, and it passed down

from them in direct succession into church history. To the watcher of the Church of Sardis the apostle is bidden to write,—"I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead. Be watchful, and strengthen the things that remain, that are ready to die. Remember, therefore, how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast and repent. If, therefore, thou shalt not watch, I will come upon thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee." The more sacred and divine we can prove any house to be, so much the more certain it is that it cannot be exempted from the visitation of the Son of Man. Whatever the household may be in which the Son of Man has set us to serve and watch for Him, —church, nation, school, factory, family, shop,—here He will be revealed at some hour when we think not as the housebreaker, unless we are now ruling our household diligently in the fear of God, as His household of which we are only the stewards and ministers, which has been instituted as much for our fellow-servants as for us.

VIII.

THE PRESENTATION OF THE FIRST-BORN, A LAW FOR THE ENGLISH AS WELL AS FOR THE JEWS.

FEAST OF THE PURIFICATION, FEBRUARY 2ND, 1873.

EXODUS xiii. 1, 2.

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Sanctify unto Me all the firstborn, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast: it is Mine."

"THE Meeting" is a very ancient name for this day's festival.* The Old Covenant and the New, the Law and the Gospel, the temporary and the permanent, the national and the universal, met together at the Presentation of Christ in the Temple. The aged Simeon perceived their union when he took the newly presented first-born Man-child into his arms, and declared Him to be at once the Light to lighten all the Nations and the glory of his own Nation.

* The Hypapante. The Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Wordsworth) dated the words of welcome addressed to the Archbishop of Syræ and Tenos on Feb. 2nd, 1870, at the consecration of the Bishop of Nottingham, ἐν Νοττιγγαμιᾳ τῇ Ὑπαπαντῇ.

I.

Why was the Only Begotten Son of God this day presented in the Temple? Because He came into the world not only as a man, not only to be the Head of the whole human order, but since no one can be true man who is not the citizen of the Nation, He came into the world as an Israelite. He came as the King of Israel; He came therefore as the subject of Israel.

For what is the king of a Nation but the highest subject of the Nation? The truest kings—men like our Alfred, or the French St. Louis, or the Swedish Gustavus Adolphus—have not only been the just administrators of national law: they have shown their subjects the most splendid example of subjection, or obedience to the national law, in their own persons. "I am not the king of France," said Louis the Ninth, "I am not the Church. It is all of you who are both king of France and Holy Church." A mere Cæsar, like a mere pontiff, must think himself above the law: one virtually says, "I am the State," like a later Louis; the other, "I am the Church." A true king, like a true bishop, must be, as the apostle says of the divine King of Israel, "made under the law."

Our own Nation has borne a continuous and costly witness to the principle that the Nation's king must acknowledge himself subject to the Nation's law, and

that if he fails in this obedience he forfeits the right to be the ruler of his fellow-citizens. The law of our Nation was not given to our fathers amidst thunderings and earthquakes; it has not come down to us bound up together with that moral law which belongs to all Nations. But, from the giving of the Universal moral law together with the Israelite national law, every Nation in the world, since the manifestation of the Lawgiver, must learn the sacred position of its own national law. A national law, to which every citizen from the king to the beggar is subject, bears witness to the existence and the claims of an Invisible King, Who is the right ruler of every creature. St. Simeon proclaimed in the *Nunc dimittis* that this hitherto unseen King had come at last to be in a special sense the King of Israel. We see Him to-day shewing His right to reign over the Jews by fulfilling to the utmost every demand which the Jewish law makes upon Him as a Jewish citizen. Though He is the Eternal Purity, He permits His mother to be purified, not because He needs it as a Man, but because it behoves Him as a Jew, and above all as the Jews' King. Though He is the High-Priest of the universe, He permits St. Joseph to buy Him off from the priesthood. The primitive priesthood, a share of which belonged to Jesus as a first-born son, had been transferred by the national law from His tribe of Judah and the other tribes to the tribe of Levi.

In the Ten Commandments we have the universal

legislation of that Word of God Who is the Unseen King of Men. By these ten laws, or the two laws into which He summarised them when He appeared amongst us, He binds all nations, and every man, woman, and child. In all the other detailed laws which He spake by Moses to the newly saved Nation of Israel—as in the law of the sanctification of all the first-born males, the setting apart to the Lord of every male that openeth the womb, both of man and beast, the law of purification, the law of redemption of the firstborn—we have His national legislation for Israel. We all agree to call the one the moral law; we have fallen into a loose way of cutting off the other from all living connection with modern life by calling it the ceremonial law. But the bringing of a son to circumcision, the presentation and redemption of a first-born son, was no more a ceremonial law to an Israelite than the paying of the taxes is a ceremonial law to an Englishman. We shall understand the sanctity and divinity of the old Jewish national law just in proportion as we acknowledge the sanctity and divinity of the most modern English national law. Laws may be imperfect: nay, they must be, for they must bear the marks more or less of the savagery, imperfection, and ignorance of their human institutors; they bear marks of the lawlessness and selfishness which they are invented to cure or to restrain. But Law is the Will of the ever-Righteous and the ever-Good. Laws are the successive expressions of a Nation's faith that such a Will ought

to be done, and that the Nation's health or salvation consists in doing it. Laws die out, change, are improved; but the Law abides. Laws would never be abrogated nor improved unless God had breathed into the Nations some faith in the existence of an eternal Law which cannot be changed nor abrogated, a perfect Law which cannot be improved, and a belief that complete conformity to the Law is the end toward which legislation ought to be progressing.

II.

The Church again to-day, as on the Feast of the Annunciation, lifts up by the hands of the evangelist the veil which hides from us nearly the whole infancy of Jesus Christ. St. Luke shews us the reputed father and the mother of the Lord, holy Simeon, and holy Anna. All these four persons were Israelites indeed; that is, they were thorough Jews, true patriots, and true citizens; they reverenced the noble national traditions; they regarded the Unseen Deliverer of their ancestors from Egypt now visible before them in the arms of Mary, and not Augustus Cæsar, nor Herod, nor the High Priest, as still the supreme ruler of Israel. We may be sure that they knew nothing of the modern antichristian theory of a citizen's allegiance to God, that they could neither of them say, "I am a Catholic first, and an Israelite afterwards." It seems, indeed, that the blessed Virgin and St. Joseph, before the prophet Simeon met them

carrying the Holy Child, had but vague and variable conjectures of the manner in which the Son of David was to ascend the throne of His father David, or of the character of His Kingdom, or of its relation to the Nations lying round them and to the great empire in which they and their old foes were included. St. Luke tells us—and it is to be believed that he received this tradition from the blessed Virgin herself—that by the *Nunc dimittis* of St. Simeon the Holy Ghost poured a flood of fresh light into the minds of His Mother and St. Joseph. "And Joseph and His Mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of Him." They began more distinctly to see in that Man-child Whom Mary carried in her arms the perfect Mediator and Uniter of the catholic and national. They ceased to separate (as their countrymen who were still in darkness virtually separated) the Christ Who is the light of all Nations from the Christ Who is the glory of their own nation. We may be asserting, by our attitude toward many a modern question, that there is not one, but two Christs, even while we think that we "believe" as we "confess," that "He is not two, but one Christ." By practical separation of the Christ from Humanity, of the Church from the State, of the christian from the citizen, of the believer from the man, we may deny the Catholic faith in a far more terrible way than the Unitarian denies it. We may assent to it as a grammar for the understanding, but reject it in the actual living battle between good and evil, right and wrong, enfranchise-

ment and bondage, God and Mammon, which is going on in the life of Nations and within ourselves.

The evangelist lifts up the dark veil with which God—perhaps for our salvation from a thousand possible superstitions and idolatries—has hidden from us nearly the whole infancy and childhood of His incarnate Son. How little even here St. Luke tells us about Him. After His Mother's purification, she and St. Joseph "brought Him to Jerusalem, to present Him to the Lord" (as it is written in the law of the Lord, "Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord"), "and to offer a sacrifice, according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons." And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth.

"Law" is thrice repeated in the Gospel: it is the great word of this festival. Law was obeyed in Jesus and by Jesus. That is the thought which possesses the mind of the evangelist of the Nations as he writes down what he has learned concerning the growing infancy of the Son of God. What law? St. Luke calls it "the law of the Lord." Remember that St. Luke was the disciple of that apostle of the Nations who told the nations that they need not obey this law, who obeyed it strictly himself, and who yet declared that the Son of God, Who had obeyed it as a Jew, had as the Man liberated Romans and Galatians from obedience to it. St. Paul laboured and suffered,

that we modern peoples—Italians, Frenchmen, Englishmen, and Germans—might not dream that we are in bondage to its sabbaths and new moons. The law was national law. The law to which Jesus Christ submitted was "State law;" it was the law of one Nation, the law of Israel; it was the law of His own Nation. The law which the true Head of the Church obeyed was "secular law"—in the pure sense of the word "secular"—for it was a law made to pass away, a law for a *seculum*, an age; it was like all wise and righteous laws, only the temporary expression of a Law which cannot pass away, an attempt to realize some conformity to a Law made for the ages of ages. I think that the Church, by calling us year after year to celebrate the fulfilment of the law of His own age and His own Nation by Him who is the bond between all ages and the common King of all Nations, would turn our thoughts toward this eternal and universal Law. I shall not, however, speak of that high Law until I have said more about the divinity of lower laws.

I can imagine the thoughts which spring up in the minds of an artisan, or a busy city man, or hard-worked professional man, as they hear the church bells ring on this day. He glances at the almanack upon his wall: "Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary," "Presentation of Christ in the Temple," "Candlemas." He thinks (if he pauses a moment to think) that this day with these quaint titles once had a serious meaning for the struggling world of men and

women. "But now," he says with a shrug, "no one thinks much of them—except our women and our clergy. It is natural that they should prolong these decaying observances; women have little to do, the clergy live by them. But the clergy can say nothing to the living conscience of the Nation for these archaic observances." When he turns back to his books and his engagements, his debts and his letters, he feels as if he had come out of a world of mists and ghosts into the world of reality.

I shall try to show you that this festival with these antique names has something to do with every merchant in London or Berlin, with every cabman driving through the streets, with every soldier in a Nation's army, with every statesman in a Nation's councils. Think of any of the great political and international questions which do not merely add excitement and interest to our newspaper reading, but which in time set Nation against Nation, hinder commerce, and thus make themselves felt in your businesses and your incomes. If the Christian Nations of Europe should be kindled to fiery war, what hands are most likely to light the first spark? Will they not be religious hands? My brethren, the law which the blessed Virgin Mary and St. Joseph obeyed, which the Son of God obeyed, was that very kind of law which the visible rival of Jesus, the bishop who thinks he has given a special exaltation to the Virgin, urges Christians not to obey if it conflicts with his laws. It was secular law, State law, national law. The law which

Christ's evangelist calls plainly "the law of the Lord" was that very kind of law which some Englishmen, alas! are inclined to call the "world's law"—which, if God does not open their eyes, they will some day go on to call the law of the devil. Jesus Christ obeyed this law because He was not only a man, a catholic, the head of a universal human fellowship; He obeyed it because, in order to be a true man, He was obliged to be a citizen; it behoved Him to be honestly and unreservedly the member of a national fellowship. He obeyed it because He came not only to be the Man of men, but the Israelite of Israelites—not only the most human amongst mankind, but the most patriotic among citizens. The Father sent Him as Son of Man to be the Saviour of *the world*, but He had also to say as a Jew, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of *the house of Israel*. This was the Lord's form of saying, "I am first an Israelite, and then a Catholic." The Head of the Catholic Church obeyed the Nation's law that He might impress on us the lesson that we cannot be true christians and churchmen unless we are true men; that we cannot be true men unless we are true citizens.

"Was not God Himself," you will perhaps ask, "the Institutor of the Jewish law? Did not the Son of God obey it that He might vindicate it as the law of His Father?" Undoubtedly. And who do you think has been the Institutor of English law, German law, Italian law? The carnal will of the natural man expressed in a vote of the majority of

carnal wills? Why that will wills lawlessness or lawbreaking, it cannot will law. The end of every national law is the same—the salvation of the Nation from its tyrants and foes, visible and invisible. The Book of Exodus shews us the beginning of all national laws; it shews us the beginning of all Nations; it shews us how the Ever-living Deliverer from tyrants and oppressors calls Nations into existence; it shows us how it is that Nations come to have laws, legislators, judges, priests, teachers, deliverers, kings. There is One Who hears their groanings, Who cares to deliver them, Who provides them with educators. Do you think it was one God who broke the chains of the slaves in Egypt, but another god who broke the chains of the slaves in America? Do you think it was one God who used the Israelites to drive the Canaanites out of Palestine but another god who used the English to drive the Welshmen out of Britain? Do you think it was one God who took the throne from Saul and gave it to David, but another god who took the throne from Pio Nono and gave it to Victor Emanuel? If so, you may say the Athanasian Hymn with your lips, but you are still a gnostic and heretic in your heart and life. You believe in one God of grace, whom you meet in the Church; you believe it is quite another god, a kind of gnostic Demiourgos, who is ruling and managing society and Nations. Perhaps you fundamentally believe that the lying tempter who tested Humanity's real King, and pretended to be the ruler of the Nations, actually

is in the nineteenth century what he pretended to be in the first century.

The temporary and secular law, to which the Son of God this day obediently submitted Himself, to which St. Joseph and the Blessed Virgin submitted, was God's law because it was the State's law. In the Epistle for this fourth Sunday after Epiphany we hear St. Paul, over and over again, urging upon the members of the contemporary Church of Rome the apostolic and catholic doctrine that the minister of the Nation's law is "the minister of God."* Rome was the nation of the Roman Christians. Three times the apostle deliberately calls the heathen and unbelieving rulers of Rome by this sacred title, which we have come to restrict to bishops and clergymen. Once in the Epistle he declares that the magistrates of Rome are what bishops and priests are—"are ordained of God." Jesus Christ, as holy Simeon declares, as the churches of all Nations sing daily in their evening and night offices, is "the Light of all the Nations," as well as the glory of His one Nation. We may be sure that He in His justice will not bring the Nations (which are all under His sceptre) to acknowledge the divine position of the catholic Church, until the Church again bears witness to the divine calling of each Nation.

III.

I must now say that the State's law, the successive

* Romans xii. 1—7. The Purification and the Fourth Sunday after Epiphany concurred on this day.

development of a national law—although it comes from Christ as "the Light of the Gentiles," and although to obey it is to obey Him—is after all passing, secular, and imperfect even as law. Every law is instituted to continue until the better Law is revealed. The national law of Israel, which the king and the two holy citizens of Israel obeyed on this day, has now passed away. Jews in our age may still go through the ceremony of redeeming their first-born sons on the thirtieth day after birth; but they are Jews who do not believe that the King and Glory of Israel has been manifested in the King and Light of the nations. They do not believe that their secular and national law has been taken away in order that the eternal and catholic Law may be revealed to all the uncircumcised and circumcised as one kingdom in the one King, as one Mankind in the one Son of Man.

What then is that catholic Law—the Law which demands obedience always from all fathers and mothers of all Nations and all times—of which this now dead law of the Jewish Nation was an imperfect expression and a stammered utterance? Let us hear the old national law of Israel. "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Sanctify unto Me all the firstborn, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast: it is Mine." The best or the first in that Nation belonged to God as a pledge that all in it was His.

Ah! this was not merely a law; it is the Law. This was not only binding on the children of Israel,

but it is binding on the children of England. The best and first in every Nation belongs to the Invisible Father! The firstborn, the most choice, the most longed for, the person or the thing about whom or which the most eager hopes and purposes of Israelite or English folk have clustered and do cluster—this is God's. The first-born son, the prime of all our produce and our toil, whatever the Israelite or the Englishman possesses which is best—this belongs to the King of Israel and England; this belongs to the Saviour and Judge of the Nations, Who has led them forth out of bondage or savagery, and cared for them through ages of culture, and raised up legislators and prophets and liberators, or has delivered them into captivity, out of His care for the growth of His peoples in morality and wisdom.

He Who once gave Himself to God on this day, He Who was once given to God by His parents on this day, now says yearly by this festival to every man and woman in Christendom, "Give thy best unto God." I do not mean that Jesus Christ says, "Pour out all you have, or pour quantities into the offertory." The apostle of the Nations tells you that you may beggar yourself out of a fanciful piety, and yet, after all, may have given up nothing to the eternal Charity. What do we see Mary to-day offer? Her first-born Son. What do we hear St. Simeon remind us to-day of the quality of her sacrifice? "Yea, a sword shall pierce through thine own bosom." He foretold her that she was giving up her only child to

suffering, to misunderstanding, to want, and to the Cross.

Do not some fathers and mothers think, as they witness the Presentation of the Son in the Temple, that they ought to imitate it? A little while ago the Church of our Nation was keeping a fast because the temple of God, the house of prayer for all Nations, was in want of sons. The Spirit of God may have stirred some one on that day to the resolve—"I will give up one of my children to the Lord. I will not redeem him from the service of the Lord. I will not give my produce and my earnings instead of my son. The Lord God shall have my man-child." Ah! but which child? I will quote a passage from an English writer of that period of the seventeenth century in which the English Nation was specially stirred upon the subject of education, during which Milton's great "Tractate" appeared. "I have heard a parent say, upon the observation of some defects in his child, that his child is fit for nothing, literally for nothing. Then, replied one, make him a parson or a vicar; he is not so wanting but you may make him either the one or both."* This was the old conceit, when the Puritans were lording it in every English parish. Is it not a very modern conceit? Is it not an Anglican conceit? For the function of money-making, for the vocations of commerce, law, medicine, fighting, the best must

* "The Child's Portion, namely Good Education." By E. W. 4to. 1649. P. 19. The book appeared with the *imprimatur* of a number of well-known Puritan ministers.

be given up; but for that universal vocation whose work it is to explain and exalt all the other vocations —for this hardest business of all, which grows harder in each generation, the fool of the family is enough.

I know it may be said that the life of a priest, unless he strives to be a keen man of business rather than a teacher and helper of his Nation, offers but a little brighter hope in our land than the life of an agricultural labourer: that in a Church in which only a portion of the clergy are "established," although it is called, somewhat ironically, the Established Church, love for the truth and righteousness of Christ will not count for much; money will count for much, birth will count for much, flattery and persecution of patrons will count for much, but a glib capacity for defending vested interests will count for most. It may be true: but the fault lies greatly at the door of the Lord's congregations or churches in the land, who endure with idle and slavish content as churchmen what they would not endure as citizens—the forcing of any man upon them as their priest and representative whom their patron and his patron pleases. Authority in the Church has remained feudal and semi-barbarian while authority in the State has been growing more and more national and civilized. Yet your patrons only appoint over you, as congregations, men whom you as parents have first given to the Lord for His priesthood. The priests of the future congregations are now children in the present congregations. What sort of priests can a Church and Nation expect to have

so long as the refuse of the family, worthless for narrower service, are sent to do the hardest and most arduous of all services? How can the Church expect to meet the troubles which are coming to try all them that dwell on the face of the earth, so long as she is not like Mary fulfilling at once the national law and the catholic law, the law for the time which now is and for the times which are to come, by presenting and sanctifying her first-born unto GOD?

IX.

BLESSING PERSECUTORS: ST. PAUL'S CHARGE TO THE CHURCH OF ROME.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY, JANUARY 19, 1873.

ROMANS xii. 14.

"Bless them which persecute you: bless, and curse not."

IT is a noteworthy fact for modern Christendom, that this charge of the Apostle of the Nations was addressed to the Church of Rome. When we use these words, "the Church of Rome," we seldom mean by them exactly what St. Paul meant. We do not think of a Christian society confined to one city and district. We think rather of a quasi-universal society spread through all Nations, and consisting of the totality of Christians who regard the contemporary bishop of the Roman Church as the visible representative of the Ascended Head of all Churches, and who are now further bound to listen to him as the audible substitute for that Everlasting Spirit Who is the leader into all truth.

I.

The Church of Rome to which St. Paul wrote this counsel still exists in our days. There is no society in the world of which the historical continuity is more certain. It consists still, as it did in his days, of all the baptized in Rome, the children in God of the Roman bishop, the foremost prelate of the Italian Nation. We have almost lost, however, the divine conception of a Church as a whole which was present to the Apostle's mind, and we speak loosely of the Church of Rome as if it were really co-extensive with the ambitious claims of its bishops.

This letter of St. Paul is the earliest authentic document connected with the Church of Rome. It is not the least noteworthy fact in this document, that its writer does not seem to care who is the bishop of Rome. He no more mentions the name of the contemporary Roman bishop than the names of the contemporary Corinthian or Philippian bishops. The authority of "the Church" (or entire Christian society) in the first ages was much greater than the authority of the single member of the Church whom it had chosen to be its bishop. In St. Paul's mind the bishop was lost behind the Church, and was almost invisible in comparison with the Church. In later ages the Church became lost behind the bishop. The apostle writes to the entire *Church* of Rome—"to all that are in Rome,

beloved of God, called to be saints." He includes therefore the contemporary head of the Roman Church (the "pope" of that day) within the number.

There can be little doubt that in St. Paul's age the Roman bishop was the subject of the Roman emperor. The apostle says in the beginning of the thirteenth chapter of this letter to the Roman bishop and Roman Church, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers: for there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." There is a kind of irony in the fact, considering later history, that the strongest assertions of the sanctity of secular authority in the New Testament are made by St. Paul in his letter to the Church of Rome, and by St. Peter, "the first pope." In the age of the birth of the Church of England, the bishops of the Roman Church were still subjects of the Roman emperors, who were then Greeks by race: St. Gregory the Great, to whom our fathers owed their baptism, appealed to the Cæsar at Constantinople not to confirm his election as bishop by the Roman clergy and people. Two centuries later the Roman bishops were still virtual subjects of the new German Roman emperors. I believe that the National Churches of Europe can never recover faith in the Unity of the Church until the bishops of Rome accept the position marked as their right position by the providential order of the Heavenly King, that is, as the foremost bishops of the Church of Italy. So long as any kind of primacy is granted to the Roman bishop over the bishops of other Nations, and to the Roman Church or

See over other Churches or Sees, a reunion of the whole Church on the solid foundation of accomplished fact —the foundation indicated by the World's Ruler—is utterly impossible. Suppose that the seventy cardinals were to elect "a pope," who chose not to be an Italian, but to live in Jerusalem or elsewhere instead of in Rome; suppose that the Church of Rome—that is, the totality of the clergy and laity of Rome, Christ's Roman congregation—were called upon by the Italian State to elect a bishop for the carrying on of the necessary episcopal government and ministry. Which would be "the successor of St. Peter," or the successor of the humble pastor who first opened and read St. Paul's epistle eighteen centuries ago? Which would be bishop of Rome? The creature of the international clique of cardinals? or the chosen representative of the actual Church of Christ in Rome?

The Church of Rome in St. Paul's age seems to have held a real pre-eminence amongst the churches. But it was no secular or worldly pre-eminence, such as was naturally soon to gather about it as the Christian fellowship of the central city of civilization; such as its bishops began early to assert for their Church or See; such as they now claim, not for their Church or See, but for themselves. It was altogether spiritual and moral. The early pre-eminence of the Church of Rome was not the work of the evil spirit of lying and murder; it was not the work of forgers of lying decretals and falsifiers of documents, not the work of schemers and diplomatists, not the work of

armies and inquisitors. It did not rest upon the pre-eminence of that Church's bishop. It was the work of the Holy Spirit in the members of that Church. "Your *faith*," says St. Paul to the Roman Church in his first chapter, "is spoken of throughout the whole world." "Your *obedience*," he says in his last chapter, "is come abroad unto all men." This catholicity of the Roman Church filled the heart of the Apostle of the Nations with joy.

To this Church St. Paul wrote, "Bless them which persecute you." The Church of Rome stood perhaps in greater risk of persecution than any other Church. In Rome was the Cæsar, the great man-god, who cared not what religion men followed, what gods the crushed and captive Nations worshipped, so long as they acknowledged his pontifical supremacy as lord of Rome and of the world over them all, and took out a licence from him for their religion. St. Paul, however, did not write to the members of the Church of Rome as adherents of a new religion, but as men who had come to believe in Him and obey Him Who is "Lord both of the dead and living."* The Roman Church believed that a King to whom the Cæsar as much as themselves owed subjection had sent out His legates to "all nations."

The apostles of Jesus Christ were neither rebels nor planters of rebellious societies in the midst of the Roman empire. But by the very terms of their commission they were forced to acknowledge a divine

* xiv. 9.

right of existence for the "Nations." The Cæsars were trying to obliterate "all Nations," in order to found their form of universal society, a world-wide, denationalized, secular Romanism—the type of the later world-wide and denationalized ecclesiastical Romanism—upon the ruins. The apostles incited no slaves to rise against their owners But they were obliged by their gospel of a Liberator of all men to assert a divine freedom of the will for every slave. They were obliged by preaching one God and Father of all to demand brotherhood for every slave from every master. The Church and the Empire were necessitated by the constitution and aim of each to come into collision. Jesus Christ and Cæsar were alike in this, that each demanded "all Nations" and "every creature." The Emperor's law said to the slave, "Thou art a chattel," though it punished him if he did yield the free obedience of a man. The Church's baptism said to the slave, "Thou art the liberated son of the Lord of emperors and masters;" it called upon him to renounce unfilial acts toward God and unbrotherly acts toward his master and his fellow-servants. Yet what was the apostolic charge to men so exalted, whom he calls "heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ"?* It was not, "Rebel against those that persecute you; you are their equals as men, their superiors as Christian men." It was the very opposite, "Bless them that persecute you: bless, and curse not." It was a hard demand; we can scarcely

* viii. 17.

enter into its trying stringency in our generation. Persons may still be persecuted amongst us; nay, perhaps all must be in some form or other, at some time or other, who are determined to keep the Catholic Faith whole and undefiled. But the kingdom of Jesus Christ has so forced itself into the sphere of civil law and national government, public thought is so far Christianized, that any persecution of the Church as a whole is in our time impossible.

I have already said that the very Church of Rome to which St. Paul wrote this charge still exists in our age. The name of that Church has been for many centuries,—how far justly or unjustly does not now concern us,—connected as no other name has been with the continuous exercise of persecution. Its name has been less connected than any other name, except in some noble missions and in plots against national order, with the endurance of persecution. The student of the history of the Latin Empire in the East, or of the struggles of the Churches of the Nations towards independence and light, might imagine that St. Paul had really written to the Church of Rome, "Persecute them which rebel against you: curse, and bless not." The present bishop of that Church to which St. Paul wrote the longest of his epistles, the successor of the humble overseer to whom the apostle originally said, "Bless them which persecute you: bless, and curse not," is chiefly known by modern Christendom as the greatest curser whom the world contains. The newspapers of every Nation

and language print every few days amongst their latest telegrams some fresh curse of the bishop of Rome against the liberators of Nations and the witnesses for the liberty of Churches, whom he supposes to be persecuting him or his representatives. St. Paul's epistle to the Romans is therefore no old Hebrew document, void of modern uses. It has a living connection with the subjects which stir the interest and guide the political action of men who think it a dead letter in an old book. Its few short chapters may be a useful companion to one of the most wonderful products of modern energy and science, the daily newspaper. However it may be with others, I may say for myself that I could not understand the daily newspaper unless I understood a little of this epistle.

Some of you may think that I have spoken too much of the Church of Rome. If you do, you must put part of the blame upon the Church of England, which still retains, in common with the other Churches of the western Nations, a section from the very earliest document relating to the Church of Rome as the Eucharistic Epistle for this week. I think that the Epistle will speak more distinctly to us if we recollect that St. Paul wrote his letter to a particular society: I think that it will speak most distinctly if we realize that the very same society, the once-persecuted Church of Rome, is still existing. The apostle himself (although he probably did not anticipate it when he was writing) was slain in the first great and

general persecution of the Church of Rome under the Cæsar Nero. The change from his time to our time is indeed wonderful. An ecclesiastical Cæsar, not elected by the Christian clergy and people, now sits in the seat of the humble bishop who received St. Paul's letter. But the persecution of the Roman Church is no longer probable: a national ruler, the choice of the Italian and Roman people, sits on the secular throne of Rome.

II.

St. Paul, however, wrote to the members of the christian fellowship in Rome as members of the universal Church of Jesus Christ. His letter was addressed to each and all. "To all that are in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints." His words, therefore, about the right behaviour toward persecutors are good for us. The Teacher Who inspired him to write them had all future Churches and Christians in His mind. He Who gave an Apostle to the Nations has caused his words to be translated into strange tongues, and to be appropriated by new churches. It is our calling as English priests to tell Englishmen that they are the "beloved of God, called to be saints."* Have not you received God's perpetual sign and seal of His love toward you in Jesus Christ? Have we not been told, one and all, by our baptism that we "are the children of God"?† To

* i. 7. † viii. 16.

each of us, then, Christ's apostle says, "Bless them which persecute you: bless, and curse not."

Perhaps the hearing of these words, joined with some recollection of the happy change which the progress of the kingdom of God has brought about in the outward condition of the Church, may set one and another asking, "After all my search for a persecutor, a character few of us are unwilling to discover, can I honestly say that any one persecutes me?" A little meditation over this question will lead us, I think, to praise God for the increasing reflection of the kingdom of His Son in English institutions, and for the work of His convincing Spirit in English thought. The persecution of persons for loyalty to Jesus Christ as King can never be pushed in our land to the terrible degree of ignorant savagery and cultured bitterness which the Christians in Rome eighteen hundred years ago understood by the word "persecution."

I know, indeed, there is a great deal of fancied persecution of persons in our time and land. Many boys and girls, whose parents interfere with their religious tastes rather than with their personal loyalty to Jesus Christ as King of conscience, dream that they are persecuted, and some take a luxurious pleasure in the dream. I have had to deal with some who obtusely connected their reconciliation to their mother, the Church, with a certain amount of proud quarrel against their parents. I have had to tell them that the Church by her confirmation of

their baptism pledges them to endeavour a more perfect honouring of their parents, a more self-forgetting love for brothers and sisters, and a grander reverence for the divine order of the family than they had before their baptism, or before their baptismal standing was confirmed. If the exchanging of the fellowship of a sect for the consciousness that he is in fellowship with the Church makes a young man more sectarian than ever, who can be the gainer by this exchange? The Church is no gainer, for the convert shows that he has no higher conception of her than that she is the most preferable of sects. The convert is no gainer, for he has merely poured the fluid of his narrow hopes and thoughts in a differently figured mould. Some few persons in turning away from a narrow communion to the universal one, and from fellowship with a club built upon agreement in opinions to fellowship with all Nations and with every creature, may indeed suffer something like a real persecution. The apostle shows them the right way of exhibiting a churchly spirit in contrast to a schismatic spirit: "Bless them which persecute you."

If, indeed, we are to judge from the complaints we hear, or if the surrounding world is to judge from the complaints we make, there are few Christians who have not "those which persecute" them. Trace up almost any complaint to its source, and you will find that its source is thought to lie in some person or persons. We begin as children to look for the evil-doer

as soon as we have found an evil: if a child trips and falls, he will sometimes run off to a distant companion and slap him as the cause of an evil with which he had nothing to do. Few of us like to confess that the wrongs or mishaps which we suffer have any part of their root in ourselves. At least, if we ever trace them to any root in ourselves, we find that we are in ill case because we have been too good, too indulgent, too patient; we find that we are persecuted because we have blessed too much, or have not cursed enough. When we have discovered our persecutors, or when our ingenuity has tracked down the persons of whom we think we have just cause to complain, the apostle tells us what we are to do with them—"Bless them."

St. Paul does not merely give us a piece of good advice. He speaks as an apostle, the representative sent forth by a King. He brings forward nothing new: he cites and applies the absolute law of the King which He delivered in His Sermon on the Mount; "Bless them which curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." It may be, as some have said, that the very expression of the Lord had reached St. Paul through the tradition of the Church. As it is a law of our King, and not the mere advice of a teacher of morals, our disregard of it is an act of rebellion. This new *lex talionis*, this christian law of revenge, must have seemed a strange precept to the Romans. Does it not seem

quite as strange to us, to whom it is now a very old law of eighteen centuries' standing? I should rather say, does not this law find something strange to it within us, which, even while it is refusing to obey it, confesses it to be the eternal absolute law to which obedience is due? The devil says, "Persecute them that bless you." The flesh says, "Persecute them that persecute you, bless them that bless you." There must be a hard war in ourselves before we can bring ourselves to submit to the Spirit's law which says, "Bless them that persecute you."

I take it for granted that the mass of us who are here have no such great persecutors as those cruel foes of the Roman Church for whom Christ's apostle demanded the blessing of the Roman Church. But how are we to bless small and petty persecutors, the worriers and tormentors by whom God puts our patience to the proof? Perhaps the word which St. Paul uses will help us to some answer. He says, εὐλογεῖτε. We have no exact equivalent in our tongue; but we have adopted the Greek word, and put it to English uses. It retains in our tongue almost its native sound, although it does not suggest to us the whole of its native meaning. "*Eulogize* them which persecute you: eulogize, and curse not." Certainly we no longer take a eulogy and a blessing to be synonymous. But the English word may help us to see more distinctly the character of the act which the common Mediator of the persecuted and the persecutors requires of us. "*Speak well* of them

which persecute you: speak good, and curse not; give *benediction*, and not malediction." To speak well is to wish well to the person spoken to; to wish well is to bless.

A great Italian theologian, who himself suffered much persecution, pertinently asks, in his commentary upon this epistle, "How can we commend a reviler or evil-doer? If we say to him or of him that which he does not merit, shall we not be found liars?"* He answers his own question with the saying of Epictetus, "Everything has two handles. A wise man considers by which of these two he shall lay hold of the thing—by its right one or its wrong one. If you take hold of it by some point at which it cannot long be held, you lose your labour!" It is so with mankind. Persecutors have at least this in common with confessors, those who curse have this in common with those who are called to bless, that they are partakers of that one Humanity of which Jesus Christ is the new Adam. Broken and sundered as our Humanity is by us and in us, it is undivided in Him Who is at once the Head of the Church and the Head of every man. None can be found so wicked and so graceless but that he who judges honestly, and who holds the faith that the True Light is enlightening every man who comes into the world, must hope and expect to find something good (that is, some gift of God) in him. As Peter Martyr says of the confessor David, "When he could justly say little else that was

* *Peter Martyr.* In Epist. S. Pauli ad Rom. Basel. 1558.

good of his persecutor Saul, he bent his whole mind to reverence him as the Lord's anointed." It was once a common proverb in English mouths concerning one who died a martyr for the independence of the English Church and the solidarity of the English Nation, "Do my lord of Canterbury an ill turn, and you make him your friend for ever." The primate of England was virtually murdered by his own queen for bearing witness to her own right that she reigned by the grace of God and assent of the English people, and not by the complaisance of the Roman Bishop. This grand canonization of Archbishop Cranmer by the national and popular conscience, the verification of the common voice, as Shakspeare has finely called it, seems to me to outweigh all the half-cursing judgments passed upon him by angry party scribes and the ferret-eyed evidence-hunters of literature. It is far nearer in moral likeness to the early canonizations of national saints by the national Churches than are the theatrical absurdities called canonizations in modern Rome.

We have, however, the highest example of the fulfilment of this law in Him Who gave the law, Who now administers it, and Who avenges its violation. When Judas came forward to kiss our Blessed Lord, He simply said, without a syllable of cursing, "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?" When His persecutors had fastened Him to the cross, He prayed for them, "Father, forgive them." Nay, more than this,—in St. Paul's sense of the word He *eulogized*

those who were cursing Him. He Who knows all things searched out and found what one good and kind thing He could say of them. He said, "They know not what they do."

I ought not to leave unnoticed—for it cannot be purposeless—St. Paul's repetition in the text. He is content with one repetition of those counsels which occur in earlier and in later parts of this epistle; but this counsel of blessing He utters twice. "Bless them which persecute you: bless, and curse not" is, we may be sure, no mere tautology. It shows us what a dominant place this law of the kingdom of the Son of God held in the apostle's conception of christian subjection and obedience. Even in the repetition of it he manages to say it twice over. "Bless;" here is an act every Christian must be doing: "and curse not;" here is an act from which every Christian must be refraining. He does not hide the fact from us that we Christians shall be tempted to curse our enemies—especially if their enmity is continuous; still more, if our endeavours to bless and to do good bring us no relief, and bring them to no better mind. He exhorts us to make blessing the abiding thought of our minds, eulogizing the habit of our tongues.

The discovery of the unfathomable depth of human sympathy in the Godhead, which is disclosed to us in proportion as our conscience and reason apprehend "rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ," must liberate us from dependence upon intermediators. We can neither invoke the saints, having such

a Mediator as the Son Who is the Man, nor choose them as patrons, believing we have been chosen already by that Patron who is the Father of all. But the dedication of our churches in their names must be worthless if it is meaningless; it ought not to be meaningless. Will it not help you (for whom the church of St. Stephen is the earthly centre of your congregational and churchly life) to connect this law with your own daily lives, if you recollect that the church in which you assemble for doctrine and worship stands dedicated to God under the name of the Protomartyr, who died praying for those who were persecuting him, and blessing those who were cursing him?

X.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED; THE MANIFESTATION OF GOD IN SAVING THE LEPER AND THE CENTURION.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY, JANUARY 26, 1873.

ST. MATTHEW viii. 10—12.

Jesus "said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

THE Church of England has been saying for a thousand years, "Whosoever wills to be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith: which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the Catholic Faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity." She is now asked—that is, you and I are asked—either to cease making this confession of our fathers a part of the common national worship; or so to modify and alter the psalm of which these words are the key as to avoid giving any shock to some of the convictions of the age and some of the

passing religious sentiments of the age; or else to leave each individual priest to decide for his flock that, if he dislike it, they shall not use it.

The request is no new one. It was first made in the Church of England about two centuries ago, by a very acute and brilliant reasoner who had been recently drawn out of the nets of the Jesuits and reconciled to the Church of England by the great Archbishop Laud. Chillingworth complained that he found three difficulties in the doctrine and common worship of the Church of England. First, he thought that by the use of the Fourth Commandment in its entirety at the Eucharist, without any explanatory clause, we pledged ourelves to keep the Sabbath, which he thought unchristian. Secondly, he thought the use of the words "blasphemous fables," applied in the 31st Article to the Roman doctrine of the "sacrifices of masses," together with some other expressions in the Articles, to be wholly false and wrong. Thirdly, he thought that by the use of the Athanasian Hymn, the Church took upon herself to limit the mercy of God. It is at least important to notice from what sort of man the protest against the Creed first arose within the English Church, and also what kind of objections then accompanied this objection.

I.

I do not propose to preach this morning about the Creed. I should shrink from doing so unless I had

prepared myself by a very long study of all that has been said or is now said against its use, and unless I had a whole series of sermons before me: much more, then, must I renounce any such attempt in the few minutes which I can give to so measureless a subject in one morning's sermon. But I have quoted its three first verses: there are certain leading words and phrases in these verses; everyone must perceive that, unless he understands these words and phrases, it is impossible to understand the Creed. What they mean to a man in his ordinary use of them, what they seem to mean to him when he hears them read from the Bible or sings them in other hymns, or offers them to God in his most real prayers, that they must mean to him in this Creed. A few days ago I heard a very long and eager debate upon the Athanasian Creed: defenders of it, opposers of it, all alike flung about recklessly these words and phrases. I went only as a learner. I was anxious to hear all that could be said against the use of the Creed as an act of common national worship. I had no desire to hear anything said in its defence. I hope I have never had much relish for mere verbal defences and apologies for the Catholic Faith. I cannot bring myself to care very much for any other apology for the Faith except that which is made by the worship of the Church, by the life of the Church, and by the living application of the Faith to the new questions and new wants with which the Spirit of Life fills each succeeding generation. I believe that our mightiest

apologies for the Faith are made when we are not thinking of it, but of that God and that Humanity, whose union and mediation in the person of Jesus Christ this Creed so wonderfully sets forth. I do not know how to regard the Athanasian Hymn as a "besieged castle to be defended;" but it seems to me to be a weapon of attack, which may become mighty through God to the pulling down of the strongholds behind which many lies and injustices of our own generation, the evil traditions and corruptions of prior generations, lie entrenched. It is the "Marseillaise" not of one class or one Nation, but of Humanity and of every creature.

In nearly every battle I have witnessed, in real life or in books, between the opposers of the Athanasian Hymn and the defenders of it, their agreement has seemed to me far more marvellous than their discord. They agree in a good end, for we must take every disputant's end to be what he says it is: some are wishing to keep it, others are wishing to be rid of it, for the glory and the knowledge of God, for the profit of the Church, and for the good of all men. But they seem to agree still more in what I must call the dreadful unanimity with which, whether friends of it or foes of it, they take it for granted that no one need ask himself, that the Holy Ghost does not move him to ask, What do I seriously mean by these words and phrases? Do I mean something of divine clearness and sun-like lucidity, or do I mean something vague and dark and confused? The uninquiring content

with which Papist and Protestant, Catholic and Arian, orthodox believers and the inventors of new sects and religions, fling about such words as "salvation," "perishing," "everlastingly," such terms as "*holding* the Faith," "*keeping* the Faith," is to me the most amazing thing in this and in almost all controversies.

The Holy Gospel with which the Church to-day provides us offers occasion to suggest a little—it can be only a little, and only suggestion—upon the interpretation of some of these words and phrases. Do not the three verses which I have read as the text seem to you even at the most cursory glance to suggest some explanation upon the three first verses of the Creed? We find all the thoughts which appear in the verses of the Creed appearing in these verses of the Holy Gospel. "Whosoever will be saved," is, in the original, "whosoever *wills* to be saved." A will for salvation is the primary thought presented to us by the language of the Hymn. The English passive must not be unregarded. "To be saved" is not to save one's self by adopting schemes or views, but to find and be found by an already existing Saviour.

II.

The Church at this season in each week's Gospel points out to us the Epiphany or Manifestation of God in Jesus Christ. What was the very first and clearest thing which the lowest in the Jewish mob, and the outcast lepers, and the heathen soldier per-

ceived in Jesus Christ's acts? The signs and manifestation of a Saviour. What became most manifest to them in Jesus as they saw more and more of Him? *The Saviour.* That there is such a Person, with such a desirable and glorious office, the Creed declares. That every thinking human creature wishes and desires to find this Person, and to experience the supernatural work of His office, the Creed implies by its very first words—*Whosoever wills to be saved.* What persons do not will this? There are some who are so "dead in trespasses and sins" that they do not will to be saved. They will to perish eternally. They do not will temporal death as martyrs do, as sufferers may; but they will eternal death. Their death, as the apostle witnesses, is no merely future state: they have not to wait for it: they are in it now—they are dead. We need not travel out of the Church, we need not go among heretics, we need not go out of ourselves, to find these persons. You and I, who say the Creed, fall into this eternal death which is always close to us, you and I *will* to be damned instead of willing to be saved, at every moment in which we are deliberately choosing evil above good, wrong rather than right, malice instead of charity, a lie instead of the truth, impurity in preference to chastity—above all when we will not to know God rather than to know Him. The Saviour says to all who will to be saved that eternal life *is* to know God and Jesus Christ Whom He has sent. He utters the germ of the Athanasian Hymn in

saying it. The Church speaks evangelically by this Creed to all the lepers and the heathenish ones who will to be delivered out of this eternal death and to enter into this eternal life.

In the Holy Gospel we see two persons who will to be saved—the Jewish leper and the heathen centurion. By looking at the Gospel we may experience a great relief, for there we shall see "salvation" in the awful sphere of life and reality, not in the deadly sphere of syllables and controversy. Each of the men means something by salvation, and knows what he means. Each man wants a real deliverance. Each man knows what salvation must be, and what life must be, because he is experiencing what perishing is, and what death is. Each "wills to be saved" from a damnation and a death which he cannot put out of his thoughts as a matter of the future. Each man has been an inquirer. Each has asked himself, and asked all sorts of men, "What must I do, who will to be saved? Is there anywhere in the universe for outcast lepers, eaten up with disease and abhorred by their fellows, a saving Healer? Is there anywhere for a loving master losing his beloved servant, a saving Restorer?" The Holy Gospel shews us that each man, by some means or other, heard that there was a Saviour. By whatever outward lips the news reached these men, it was a Divine Teacher Who really spoke to each of them by those lips. The good news, the Gospel, the Creed, the Faith, the message (call it what we will), which the Divine Teacher con-

veyed to the leper and the heathen, may have reached their minds in a confused and fragmentary form. But this must have been the substance of that Faith to which the Divine Teacher called each of them: "If you will to be saved before all things it is necessary that you go in faith to Jesus Christ. He has come forth from God." There is but one Divine Teacher poured out upon all flesh, that Spirit who bears witness that Jesus is the Christ, that Spirit who takes the things of Jesus and shews them unto men. What He said eighteen centuries ago by some unknown and half-instructed men or women, or through the news-telling eagerness and hearsay faith of the Jewish crowds to an outcast leper and an uncircumcised heathen who willed to be saved, that the same Teacher says to-day by the deliberate words of the Creed to "everyone soever who wills to be saved."

III.

In the third verse of the Athanasian Hymn the Church makes the statement which ought not, I think (considering a present habit of thought), to pass through our lips without startling us. What is the Catholic Faith? It is not this, that we should hold certain notions about the Eucharist, about confession, about ritual, about usages to which a party gives the universal title of "Catholic." The Church says, "And the Catholic Faith is this"—we should expect her to continue, "*That we believe* in one God."

But this is not here (as in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, each of which is absolutely a *Credo*) her way of continuing. "The Catholic Faith is this: *that we worship* one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity." The Church seems to have a motherly terror over her children, lest they should look upon the Catholic Faith as an assent to a crowd of propositions, and over her teachers lest they should employ and expound the Creed as a deadly "grammar of assent." She forces us at the very beginning of that Creed which is most likely to be regarded as a bundle of theological propositions, to connect faith at once as a living act with the act of worship. This, you may remember, is also the tone of the wonderful collect which the Church puts into our lips on Trinity Sunday. This is the reason why the Catholic Faith is not thrust into the faces of men, man by man, as a test; but is sung or said by the whole congregation of the Lord as an act of worship. This, too, is exactly what we see to-day in the Holy Gospel.

Each of the two men who willed to be saved, as far as he was able in his circumstances and with his training, said his creed: each expressed his faith in the act of worship. "There came a leper and worshipped Him, saying, *Lord.*" "There came unto Him a centurian beseeching Him, and saying, *Lord.*" These two new believers, these fathers of a believing Church, in calling the Son of Man *Lord*, uttered the germ of the Athanasian Hymn as the Church's act of worship. How much they meant or how little they

meant by calling Him Lord Whom they confessed to be their only hope of salvation, is of the least importance. It would be absurd to expect from their consciousness such a perfect and catholic confession as even apostles could only stammer and stutter until the Day of Pentecost was fully come. The Church is shewing us in their salvation an Epiphany of God in His Son. It is of the very essence of the Self-discovery of God to men that it is gradual, and proportioned to their receptivity. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." It is a serious thought, my brethren; our knowledge of God and of His will and ways is always depending upon our fitness to receive the knowledge. The Holy Gospel shews us that the measure of our faith, by which we honour Him and worship Him, is the measure of our fitness. The Saviour directed His own disciples to the faith of the uncircumcised centurion. He called those catholics, He calls afresh this week all catholics, to look at the catholic faith of a man outside the covenant, —at His saving of a man who was outside the organic "state of salvation." "Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not (in the very home of faith) in Israel." He said to the Gentile whom every pious bystander must naturally have regarded as an unbeliever, "Go thy way, and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee."

What person do you and I mean, of whom do you and I first think, when we say, "*Whosoever* will be

saved"? This Creed contains what some persons call "damnatory clauses," what others prefer to call "warning clauses." Well, to whom do we think that they apply? Now in this Hymn we speak both of a judgment upon evil-doers and a judgment upon unbelievers. There is nowhere else, in all our offices, a more direct assertion of the fact that it is for our life, and not for our mere religious or theological opinions, that the Judge is coming to judge every one of us. "All men," says the Hymn, "shall give account for their own *works*." "And they that have *done good* shall go into life everlasting; and they that have *done evil* into everlasting fire. This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved."* The moral statements of the Hymn must have been as disagreeable to the Antinomians and Solifidians of the last century as its theological statements were to the Arians of that century. The wonder is that the Pharisees and Sadducees did not come to one of their historical truces, and combine together to destroy the Creed which demanded from the one a real morality, and declared to the other that the Son of Man is the Son of God. The unbeliever is not separated from the misdoer; the acceptance of doctrinal propositions is not substituted for plain morality. If the Church were to expel

* Perhaps I need hardly say that I owe this suggestion to a paragraph in an article in the *Contemporary Review* for October, 1870, "A few more Words on the Athanasian Creed," of which the greatest doctor of the Church of our nation and generation was the author.

those clauses from the Creed, as some ask, the complaint might then more excusably be made that she had divorced theology and morals. The Church says (exactly what the universal human conscience echoes) that it must be well with every doer of good, that it must be ill with every doer of evil.

But the Church does more; she answers the inquiry of the universal human conscience, How am I to be and to do and to have the good? how am I not to be and not to do, and to be saved from, the evil? What is the answer of the Church, as given in this very Creed? She sends every one soever, as the inward Teacher sent the wretched leper and the heathen centurion, to the Absolute Good. The Church sends every one soever, Jew or Gentile, leper or sound, to the Father, the source and centre of the Good; the Church sends every one soever to the Son, Who came in manhood to manifest the Father to men, as the source and centre of the Good—to the Son Who gave the leper and the centurion the good they needed, Who saved them from the evil they felt and wished to be rid of, Who wrought this salvation on them and on theirs, that He might be the Epiphany of the Good to men of all generations and of all races, and that He may call to Him by faith "whosoever wills" to be good and "to be saved" from the evil. The Church sends every one soever to the Holy Ghost, the creator of the goodness in whatever is good. The Church calls all men to believe that the Good is the absolute and perfect Unity, to believe there is no division, no contrariety,

no war, no contest, in the Good. She calls all men to worship the One Good. "The catholic faith," the universal faith, the faith for excommunicate lepers and outcasts, the faith for despised pagans, the faith for all who share Christ's Humanity—is this, "That we should worship (*veneremur*) one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance."

The person whom you and I must mean by the "whosoever" in the first verse, and by "a man" in the last verse, must therefore be every person. For you and me it must be the new man, the believing man in you and in me. The Creed gives us no ground for threatening excommunicate lepers and outcasts, pagan centurions, Arians, deists, sceptics, or any sort of men with damnation. In it, on the contrary, we tell them of the Good, the True God to Whom all men must go in faith, Whom all must worship, "who will to be saved" out of the damnation and eternal death in which, at some time or other, they confess themselves to be. In the Creed we declare our faith in One in Whom lepers, outcasts, Samaritans, and pagans found their Saviour; in it we declare our faith that every man who wills to be saved, as those poor creatures willed, will find in Him his Saviour. But we nowhere profess in it our persuasion that any of those whom Jesus declared to be saved, held together with faith, or as a substitute for faith, what are called "Trinitarian opinions." The Church by this Hymn sends

every one of us whom she has already declared to be in a "state of salvation" to the Saviour; sends every one of us whom she has assured to be "inheritors of the kingdom of heaven" to the King. What does He, to whom the Creed sends us, say in this same Gospel to us catholic believers about the kingdom of Heaven? "Jesus said to them that followed, Truly, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." He points out to us who are in the commonwealth of Israel the living and saving faith of one who is outside it, a stranger to the promises of God. He shews us the faith of one whom we must call—if we do not enter into the meaning of the Athanasian Hymn—an unbeliever. Then He adds, "And I say unto *you*" (to you who follow me, to the contenders for the faith delivered to the saints, to My circumcised subjects, to My baptized disciples), "that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of Heaven. But *the children of the kingdom* shall be cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Thus the men who do not "believe the catholic faith," who are not "keeping it whole and undefiled," who "without doubt shall perish everlastingly," may perhaps be found amongst men who are spending their energies and their money in defending the propositions in which it is stated. The "warning clauses" warn those most seriously who

are fighting for their maintenance; the "damnatory clauses" threaten those most fearfully who may be threatening others with them. Many wretched lepers whom modern Christian society cuts off from its fellowship, many heathenish half-asserters and half-deniers of the Creed's propositions, may have thrown themselves by living faith upon the absolute Good, whose Name and whose eternal Fellowship the Creed so gloriously declares; they may be holding the catholic or universal-human faith by which a man is saved. Nay, if they are being saved, if they are becoming better and sounder men, however loose and uncertain may be the grasp of their intellect upon the catholic faith, they must be "holding" and "keeping" that faith with the living will which wills to be saved. Less than this I dare not say when I hear the evangelist and the Church say of the Incarnate Manifestation of the Good, the only Saviour: "Jesus said unto the centurion"—that half-taught heathen—"go thy way, and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee."

XI.

FELLOWSHIP WITH CHRIST IN HIS SUFFERINGS IS NOT TO BE SOUGHT IN OUR FEELINGS, BUT IN FELLOWSHIP WITH HUMANITY.

PASSION SUNDAY, APRIL 3RD, 1870.

HEBREWS ix. 14.

"Who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself."

THE Church prepares us to-day for the right keeping of the two weeks of Passion-tide, by reminding us, both through the Epistle and through the Holy Gospel, that the *Passion* of our blessed Lord was above everything a deliberate and intended *action*. I know that this will seem in words to be a contradiction. It would, indeed, be a real contradiction, but for the truth which the Church is now proclaiming—that this passion is *the* Passion; that the suffering of Jesus stands alone amongst human sufferings; that this actor and sufferer is at once God and Man, and that in Jesus Christ (as Pascal has said) all contradictions are harmonized.

It is the first contrast between our passions or sufferings and the Passion or the Suffering of the

Lord, that ours are only our passions, they are not our actions. Whether they are what we call deserved or call undeserved sufferings, we are forced to be passive under them. It is God who is active; or, by God's permission, it is the devil or the world: it is not you and I who are active. We must endure them with our will or against our will; we cannot call legions of angels—no, not even "our guardian angel"—to put a stop to them. We cannot say, I will not go up to Jerusalem; for there we are, and cannot leave it. We cannot say in our passion and death, I will not undergo this pain, this buffeting of my body with aches and wounds, this robbery of my life. We cannot say under our tribulations, I will not have this lacerating of my soul by lying words and by treachery and unfaithfulness. The betrayal, the scourge, the mocking, the spitting on, the wounding, perhaps the hard death, *happen;* and the utmost you or I can do in our passion is to determine not *whether* we will to suffer, but *how* we will to bear our suffering. Our action is only that action under passion which is passion well or badly borne.

The utmost that our action has to do beforehand with our passions is that although it does not will to bring them (as the Saviour willed to embrace His), yet it often does perforce bring upon ourselves what we do not will; our actions call down the real actors upon us as sufferers. Where our passion is the result of our sin or error, this is of course always the case. Our pride brings down upon us the

deserved scourge of our humiliators; our selfish separation from others brings upon us that merited exclusion from their synagogue and that solitude of which we complain when misery makes us look around us for some man to pity us, and we find none. The passion of Judas was going on at the same hour as the Passion of the Lord. Judas had not willed to endure his passion, but his action had brought it perforce upon himself, and he could not and would not bear it. It is the same with those nobler passions which thousands of saints and patriots and thinkers have endured after the image of the Lord's Passion for the sake of God, or their country, or mankind. By their faithful testimony to God, by their witness for truth and righteousness (which is, as St. Anselm has said, a witness and a martyrdom for Christ), by their resistance to pharisaical minorities or to brutal and tyrannous majorities, they brought upon themselves what they did not will to bring (for they would have been fanatics if they had)—the scourges, the spitting, the derision, and the rejection of those whom they willed to save, or teach, or bless. Our passions, even when brought upon us by ourselves, are not called and invited to us by our own wills.

I.

By the whole tone of the eucharistic office today the Church is directing our thoughts to the real contrast between human passions and that which is

the Human Passion. The Church, I say: for it is not merely the Church of England which speaks this language. We share our Collect, Epistle, and Holy Gospel with all the Churches of the West. So cold does the Collect seem to our imagination for a Passion Sunday, that we might be readily inclined to think, until we knew its antiquity, that it is solely an Anglican Collect. But this same Collect is being offered to-day under the roof of St. Peter's at Rome, and in every church of the Latin rite all over the world. The key-note of this great mystery is struck in the words of the Epistle: Christ our High Priest, it is there said, Himself began the action of His Passion: "*He offered Himself* without spot to God." That He could by His action have removed His Passion to any remoter date, or refused altogether to endure it, the apostle John shews us in the Holy Gospel. When Jesus had declared that He was that Eternal Word of God, that "I AM" Whom Abraham had known, "then took up the Jews stones to cast at Him"—that is, to stone Him to death as a blasphemer; it was as a blasphemer, you will remember, that these actors of His Passion and death finally brought Him to His Passion and death. "But"—for their action waited upon His action, He and not they must begin His Passion—"but Jesus hid Himself, and went out of the temple." Their hour for His Passion was come; but His hour was not yet come, and they had to wait, although they did not and would not know it, until "He *gave* His back to the

smiters," until He deliberately "*hid not* His face from shame and spitting." "I lay down My life"—He begins the action of His Passion — "that I might take it again:" He closes the Passion when He wills. "No one taketh it from Me:" the devil or the world, who are the primary actors in our passions, were not so in His: "but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have"—what no other man who suffers and dies has—"power to take it again." Power here is ἐξουσία, that rightful and authoritative power the whole of which (as our Lord said to His assembled disciples) is given unto Him in heaven and on earth; it is not the mad and lawless self-will by which Judas threw away his life which he could not take again.

Thus by the choice of the Epistle and the Holy Gospel the Church prepares us for the proper contemplation of the Passion of our blessed Lord by reminding us that it is its first and its most distinctive mark that it is His *action*. I hope to shew you that we must misconceive it, misuse and perhaps abuse the contemplation of it, if we approach it from the point of view of our fevered self-consciousness, instead of from the point of view given to us by the calm universal consciousness of the Church.

This Passion Sunday reminds us that the passion we hope to enter into and to sympathize with during these fourteen days is *not a mere passion*: it is not a mere suffering, or mass of untold sufferings. Since it is above everything else a deliberate action, it

must not be measured nor commented upon as we measure and comment upon our own sufferings, or upon the passions of our friends or of the saints. The misery of a good master at the treachery of a disciple is no measure for apprehending the suffering of Jesus Christ at the kiss of Judas. The agony which the thieves felt when the nails were driven into their hands and feet, or which St. Peter endured when he was crucified, are not measures to apply to the crucifixion of the Lord in order that we may apprehend what His crucifixion is. What the cross *is*, is infinitely more important to us than what it was.

We must not make sympathetic feeling or *compassion* with Jesus as a sufferer (like the compassion of Mary celebrated with the Passion in the Latin Churches) the test of our profit at Passion-tide. Sympathizing realization of the very minutest details of the suffering of the soul of an innocent person treated as a criminal, or of the suffering of a human body treated as the sacred body of Jesus was treated from Thursday night to Friday afternoon, is not the proper path for entering into the meaning of the Passion of the Son of God and Son of Man. Such realization depends often upon accidents, upon the vividness of our own fancy, upon our personal temperament, upon the dulness or the liveliness of the preacher who sets the details of the Passion before us, even in part upon his antiquarian acquaintance with the actual procedure of a Roman execution by the cross.

Important as such details may be to certain persons for the nourishment of their own faith, their own hope, and their own charity, something infinitely more important than any private good ought to be kept in mind by the preacher of the Passion and the meditator on the Passion. The great end of the Passion is that the whole world may have faith, that mankind may have hope, that every human creature may increase in charity. The Church takes care that we should meditate what Jesus suffered; the Spirit by Whom (as the Epistle says) the Sufferer offered Himself to God has hidden, even from evangelists and apostles, all that He suffered. The Sufferer too withdrew Himself from detailed observation,—first, from the observation of the chosen eleven at the gate of the garden; then, from the observation even of doubly chosen three within the garden; so that the whole of His Passion must be a secret between Himself and the Father and the Spirit by Whom He offered Himself. Therefore the Church takes the greatest care, by the starting-point she give us to-day, that in meditating on what He suffered we should meditate most of all Who suffered, why He suffered, and for whom He suffered. Every thought and flight of imagination toward the physical or mental details of the Passion must be kept under rule by constant recollection of the *end and purpose* of the Passion. From the evangelists we learn what Jesus suffered. From the apostles we learn the infinitely more important lesson why He suffered.

Our risen Saviour Himself first struck the true note for the right keeping of His Passion by His Church when He said to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, "*Ought not* Christ to have suffered these things?"* St. Paul takes up this true note when he says to the Corinthians, "For as the sufferings of Christ *abound in us*, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ;" and again, when he says to the Philippians, "For Him *I have suffered* the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but the righteousness which is through the faith of Christ." It is taken up again in the close of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate: let us go forth therefore unto Him without the camp, *bearing His reproach;*" or again, most triumphantly, in the second chapter.† St. Peter never tires of reiterating this exhilarating note: "Even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow His steps." "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us," he says again, "arm yourselves with *the like*

* Οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν;—Luther's "*Musste nicht?*" —Was He not obliged?

† Verses 17, 18: "Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made *like unto his brethren*, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that He Himself has suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them also which are tempted."

mind." Again he says to the strangers scattered throughout Asia Minor, "Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings." But, infinitely more than this, "Christ also hath once suffered for our sins, the Just for the unjust, *that He might bring us to God.*" His Passion is connected, in all apostolic references to it, not with what we ought to *feel*, but with what we ought to be and ought to do.

II.

There can be little doubt, I think, that there is in our time a growing danger that Christians should dwell too much upon the bodily and mental details of the Passion. An alien devotion is being introduced—devotion to the five wounds, to the precious blood, to the sacred heart, to the precious blood-sheddings, and the like. I do not say that such devotions are wrong. They had their origin from holy men and women who lived at the foot of the cross of Jesus Christ. To Him, their own Master, all His disciples stand or fall; those who invent and those who use such devotions, as well as those who cannot use them. But I will say, that to those who make this class of devotions their chief vehicle of meditation upon the Passion, the august soberness of the Church in her Collect, Epistle, and Gospel must in time come to seem cold and unsatisfying. I will say that a very long use of them must have a tendency to lead us backwards and downwards to

that from which St. Paul would lead us forward and upward: the knowing of Christ after the flesh—that is, as one particular suffering man—not as *the Man* in Whom we and all men are included. We do not know Christ in the spirit—"Who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God," —until we know Him in every man, and know every man and all humanity in Him. I will say further, that such devotions often tend to create in us a false conscience, and to lead us to apply a wrong test to ourselves in our meditations upon the Passion, and bring us into that bondage from which Christ, by the mighty action of His Passion, purposes to free us. It is the first and principal function laid upon me as a priest to liberate consciences. I shall therefore ask you, my brethren, to bear these two thoughts in mind during Passion-tide, and to ask that I may bear them in my own mind—Firstly, that sympathetic fellow-feeling, or *melancholy compassion*, is not a true test of our profit in Passion-tide. Secondly, that a vivid *realization by the fancy of the details* of the Passion is not the appointed means of entering into the fellowship of Christ's sufferings.

(1.) Many consciences are distressed by the insinuations of the devil, by the selfish desires of the flesh for consolation in its own feelings, or by the heedless and gushing rhetoric of a melodramatic preacher, because they *feel* nothing or *feel* little when they read the Passion in the Holy Gospel. They try to make up for the failure of the sober evangelists

by the use of devotional comments upon them, but still they feel little or no sadness. They make long meditations before the crucifix, but they continue, as they think, unmelted; some gushing and impassioned modern hymn which their lips say or sing finds no real echo in their hearts. They pass, perhaps, through all the services which the Church provides on Good Friday without any conscious sense of personal misery, without any felt pricking of the heart, without the shedding of a tear. The lying spirit says to them, "If the Passion of Jesus were anything real to you, would you not feel more misery?" They take him for an angel of light, and humbly reply, "We feel nothing, or feel too little." A reckless and worldly preacher cries, "Surely your heart ought to be wrung, surely your tears ought to pour down, at the sight of such a Passion as this!" But their heart is not wrung, their tears will not flow. The carnal and corrupt old man, which is within us all, says in them, "Oh that I make myself comfortable with some sense that I really do feel miserable!"

My brethren, is not Christ's Passion a part of Christ's Gospel? What is it that makes Christ's Passion joyful tidings to sinful men? It is the glorious Gospel of the Passion that it is Christ's own action: yes, that it *is* all that it is to the whole lost world independently of any feeling you or I or any one in the world may have about it. The Passion is the epiphany of the tender feeling of God for those who did not and those who do not feel

for Him. Be content not to feel. Crucify with Christ this diseased and proud longing to have something in yourself, some little passion of your own, in which the self in you can rejoice and the self in you glory. Let the Passion and Cross of Christ alone be your joy and glory. Say with him who of all mankind knew most fully what the Passion of Christ is to you and all men, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of" (my?—no, even here he stops himself from saying *my* Lord: he says for all Nations and every creature) "*our* Lord Jesus Christ!" Submit to the will of the Father Who for your real good does not grant you the luxury of sensible grief and tears, for which the old man within you lusts.

The precious blood of Jesus indeed streams forth from His most sacred body under the scourging, from the driving in of the nails, from the pricking of the crown of thorns, from the thrusting in of the spear, that you and I and all mankind may behold it and meditate upon it. But you are called into Gethsemane, called into the judgment-hall, called to the foot of the cross, not that you may weep, but that you may *believe*. A Passion-tide has not been instituted that you may gain the carnal comfort of a feeling you can hug to yourself and can call your own, and may find your joy in what you have made yourself by your devotion. It has been instituted that, in the action of Christ's Passion for you and for all, you may have hope for yourself and hope for each of whom the natural man in you despairs; that you

may have charity to those whom the natural man in you suspects and dislikes; that you also, as the Truth's disciple, may dare all things for the truth; that you also, as Christ's fellow, may endure all things for the Father and for mankind; that you also, as God's soldier, may "resist unto blood, striving against sin;" that by His blood (as the Church says in the Epistle) your *conscience* may be "purged from dead works to serve the Living God;" that you may on Easter Day take hold with thankful joy and bold faith of that cup of which Jesus says, "This is the New Testament in My Blood which is shed for you,* but is also shed for many for the putting away of sins." †

(2.) I dare not undervalue for a moment any Christian's attempt to gain a vivid realization of the details of the Passion, so far as our imagination by the help of study, scholarship, and meditation can realize them at our distance of place and condition. The evangelists give as much space to the history of one day of the Passion as they give to a whole year of the ministry of Jesus. We can never study too fully what His sufferings were, so long as we keep within the limits set us by His own Spirit in the Gospels. But the importance of Christ's sufferings in His Passion, we must recollect, does not consist in what they *were*, but in what they *were signifying*. What they were is now only historical; they are for ever over; the scourging, spitting, mocking, wounding death

* St. Luke xxii. 20. † St. Matthew xxvi. 28.

can never return. "Christ *once* suffered." But what they were signifying is eternal; that which His Passion once signified, it still is signifying to us and all the living, that it will signify to all yet unborn generations. "Christ once suffered;" but why did He suffer? "That He might lead us"—the estranged and God-distrusting race of man—"to God." Hence, while devotion to the wounds of Jesus suffering is not necessarily fellowship with Him in His Passion, though it may be so, devotion to the salvation of the human race or to the saving (that is, making whole) of one man whom we know (which were His ends in all that He suffered) is most undoubted fellowship with Him in His Passion.

If we lose the universal significance of Christ's suffering behind the details of His sufferings; if we forget that the Passion is above all else (as the Church is to-day declaring) the glorious *action* of the Son of God by which He has lead and is leading back to their Father the estranged family of Mankind of which He is the Head; if we forget that it is His seizing hold of His "royal banners," and His determined going-forth to war as the Champion of His human race against the devil, the world, and hell, and death,—neither we, nor our neighbours, nor our family, nor our nation, can be really the better for our celebration of a Passion-tide. We have come no nearer to the Cross than the old woman did in the notorious story, who indeed mourned "awhile," and who was filled with "heart-searching tears" and the

like, when her visitor related to her the touching details of the Passion; but, as soon as she heard it happened so many centuries ago, began to console herself with the ungracious hope that the Hope of the World might not be true, or that the misery had been exaggerated as the account passed from generation to generation. Or we may miss the quickening significance of the Passion as the still-heathen Chlodwig did when St. Remigius, the apostle of the Franks, first preached the Crucifixion before Him—"Had I only been there with my Franks, I would have taught those cursed Jews a better lesson." When the Burgundian king Avitus was urged by the Catholic bishops to forsake the Arian doctrines, and profess like Chlodwig the Catholic faith, he replied, "I see no faith at all where I see greed for the property of others, and thirst for the blood of the peoples. Let him shew his faith by his works." To think that it is devotion to the Passion to utter impassioned exclamations about the malice of Jews, or the worldliness of Pilate, or the foul life of Judas, or the cruelty of the scourge or nails, is to sink into the unchristian mis-sympathy of the "fierce Sicambrian."* After all, we can never realize the Passion as Peter did, as Judas did, as the soldiers did who were its callous ministers, or as the mockers did who cried, "Come down from the Cross!" They all saw the agonized face and the streaming blood of our blessed Lord not in fancy, but in fact. Yet one

* So Remigius called the Teuton king on baptizing him.

denied the Saviour, because he had realized the Passion and feared to share it. Another committed despairing suicide because he had vividly realized the Passion, and could not realize its eternal significance as the action of actions by which the Son was calling the world to faith. The others continued to increase it and to mock it.

Let us be certain, my brethren, that the Passion is not having its intended effect upon us, as the action of our Saviour, unless it sets us desiring not to *fret* but to *do*. It is not fellowship with His sufferings to weep for Him; it may be fellowship with the rebuked women who could not help Him. It is not fellowship with Him to smite our breasts; it may be fellowship with the crowd who did so when they had assisted at His crucifixion. But it is fellowship with His sufferings to make that the end of our life which was the end of His Passion. To identify ourselves with all the woes and passions of our whole race is to have fellowship with the New Adam and The Man in His Passion. To dare all things and endure all things that all men may believe that God is their Father, their Saviour, and their Comforter, and that He is not their cruel tyrant, is to have fellowship with the Son of God in His Passion. To stand champions for Humanity against a narrow religious world, and to endure to be called heretics and be cast out of synagogues, is to have fellowship with Him in His Passion. To take the scorned and the hated side in those conflicts of our own time

in which we are obliged to share; to spend our time in redeeming and liberating a man or a family, or in helping to redeem and liberate a class or a people from ignorance and error, from moral evil or from physical evil, is to enter into fellowship with the Redeemer and Liberator in His Passion. To live and to die, not for what we call the salvation of our own souls, but for the salvation of the world—which is our own truest and fullest possible salvation—is to have fellowship with the World's Saviour in His Passion. To bear with sweetness and patience the scourges with which our Father permits us to be flogged, and the nails He suffers men and devils to drive into us, is to have fellowship with the Man of Sorrows in His Passion. Many, the Lord declares, will come from the east and the west, who had no apparent relation to the father of the faithful, who perhaps neither knew the name of Jesus nor knew that He suffered, whom He will own as His fellows. Although they never shed a tear, nor felt a luxurious woe in Passion-tide, they entered into the fellowship of that Passion in which was summed up and justified every preference of suffering over unrighteousness by which the world has ever been blessed in any place or age.

A Passion-tide is worth keeping, my brethren, if its celebration unites us closer to all those for whom Christ entered into His Passion, if it creates in us a better hope for those who do not keep it, and if it increases our charity toward them and our patience with them;

if it leads us to say what the greatest doctor of the Passion said to his disciple, when the world contained a Nero and a Felix and an Agrippa, and he knew that it contained them, "Christ Jesus came into the world," and endured His Passion, "to save *sinners*, of whom *I* am chief." If we make our keeping of Passion-tide, or our manner of keeping it, the ground of a pharisaical self-satisfaction that we are "not like other men," or the ground of a party-conceit that we are not like other parties in the Church, we are at one in soul with the elder pharisees. We mock that Sufferer Who claimed equality and fraternity with the religious of the nation for all the publicans and sinners of the nation, as fellow-citizens of Israel and fellow-children of God. "For He is our peace, Who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us—that is between Jew and Gentile, between churchman and man." As He "through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God," so "through Him we both (Jew and Gentile, those afar off and those that are nigh, Christian and man) have access by one Spirit unto the Father."

XII.

EVERY-DAY MORALITY AND THE THEOLOGY OF THE DAYS OF CHRIST'S PASSION.

PALM SUNDAY, APRIL 5, 1868.

PHILIPPIANS ii. 3, 4, 5, 6.

"In lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

TO-DAY the Church has chosen for the Epistle one of the most completely theological declarations in the whole Bible. This passage is, in fact, the Catholic Creed. In it St. Paul states the eternal co-equality of Jesus as God the Son with God the Father, the real humanity of Jesus assumed in the Incarnation, the Death of the Cross, the Ascension (in which the Resurrection is implied), and the Headship of Jesus Christ over heaven, earth, and hell.

St. Paul does not cite the Creed as if it were a thing unknown to the Church of Philippi, a thing he is for the first time teaching them. He does not cite it as if he were writing biblical texts upon

which a future creed may be constructed by future sect-builders and theology-builders. He cites it for an immediate moral end. He seems to say: 'Think of the mysteries you have already confessed, on the confession of which you were admitted into the Church. You confess that the Creator and Father of all has eternally had a Son co-equal with Himself. You confess that Omnipotent Godhead has been always the property of this Person. You confess that the same Person, out of His wonderful charity for mankind weighing His own joy with the Father against their deplorable misery, actually counted His human race more dear, and precious, and important to Him than His own joy. If you will enter into the mystery of this wonderful incarnation you will see in it the archetype of that morality which I am now commending to those who are quarrelling in your Church in Philippi.'

I.

The Church not only bids us to-day to call all her faithful to the Holy Communion on Easter-day; she bids us also to urge them to prepare themselves or be prepared for coming "holy and clean to such a heavenly feast." In this preparation she gives the greatest prominence to charity between fellow-members of the same holy congregation. Those who have cure of souls are strictly ordered by the rubric not to suffer any to be partakers of the Lord's

table, "betwixt whom malice and hatred are perceived to reign."

Selfishness, self-will, self-assertion, are the simplest and the most universal names of sin: self is the factor and the principal mover of every sin. Self and the Church ought to be irreconcilable enemies. God has instituted church-life for the destruction of selfishness, for the crucifixion of self-will, for the humiliation of self. The purpose of all the sacraments is the liberation of man's will from self. Self is that old man, that fleshly lust, that corrupt nature from which we are separated in the sacrament of Baptism. Because self cannot strengthen and confirm us, but is always weakening us and throwing us back, we come to receive strength and confirmation from another, from the Holy Ghost, in Confirmation. Because self cannot rid us of our sins—since it is ever creating as many sins with its left hand as it is opposing with its right hand—we apply to be loosed by another in Absolution. Because self has no power nor will of blessing, of freeing from sin, of ministering and administering to the family of God, the cleric applies for a gift from another in Ordination. We may discover the same principle in holy Matrimony, and in the ancient use of Unction. We must expect this lesson of all sacraments to be gathered up and concentrated in that Eucharist which we so often call "*the* sacrament." The moral end of the Eucharist is the destruction of our selfishness. It is a holy communion; but com-

munion is broken, schism and quarrel begin, the moment self rises and asserts its will and lusts. It is "eucharist," a thanksgiving; by it we give thanks to God for that which self could not do, which has been done for us all by another. It is a sacrifice: a sacrifice is the most decided confession of our own self-insufficiency. It is a food: nothing bears such clear witness to us that we have in ourselves no self-sustaining and self-nourishing power as the acts of eating and drinking.

II.

Self—this chief enemy of each person, the ally in us to which our exterior foes always address themselves, the foe in the household of the Church which the Head of the Church has forewarned her will always be her most dangerous enemy — was detected by the keen apostle in the church of Philippi. Some churches gave this great father of the churches joy, some filled him with anxiety. What sort of church made him joyous? The church which was busiest at the tracking out of heresy? The church which was contending most eagerly with the State for the possession or retaining of temporal prizes? The church which was most able in the maintenance of the catholic doctrine? No; the church which lived upon that doctrine, the church which translated the catholic theology into morals, the church which manifested the truth of the Creed in the lives of her

members, the church which was most purely an epistle of Jesus Christ, the church in which men could behold "the mind of Christ"—Christ's self-emptying, His self-humiliation, His preference of the salvation of mankind to His own eternal gladness, and of the things of others to His own things. "Fulfil ye *my joy*," says St. Paul, "that ye be like-minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind. Let nothing be done through strife or vain-glory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves" (that is, superior or preferable to themselves). "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus."

The articles of the catholic Creed—the Incarnation, Passion, and Sacrifice of God the Son—are here presented by St. Paul to the conscience of the Philippian Church as the disclosure and revelation of "the mind that was in Christ Jesus." How came it to be possible that very God should condescend to be made a man, a poor man, a scorned and persecuted man, an apparent malefactor? Ordinary as the word unselfishness sounds at the first, to us, there is no diviner word in human language. That "mind," which we call in its human manifestation unselfishness, or self-sacrifice, or preference of others above ourselves, or lowliness of mind, or looking on the things of others and not looking on our things, existed before mankind was created in mankind's

Archetype and Creator. It was this "mind" which thought of the creation of a Humankind. It was this mind which when Humanity was destroying itself was caring and determining to restore it. In this "lowliness of mind," to use the apostle's language, God the Son actually esteemed sinful men and rebels as of more worth to Him than He was to Himself. The word translated "*better*" means superior or excelling, as one weight excels another, or one office is over another; it has not, like our word *better*, any regard to moral comparison. By His Incarnation, Passion, and Sacrifice, God the Son reveals to us His divine mind as a mind that "looked not on His own things"—even on His eternal power and Godhead—but "also on the things of others"—that is, on the helpless misery and need of His dear Humankind crying out to Him as its only hope, to come into its flesh, and fill it with His Spirit. Our race knew not what its aching cry for God meant. But His mind knew; and yet although response to this cry involved the sacrifice of Himself, His mind accepted the sacrifice, or rather chose and desired it. It was this mind which esteemed His being in "the form of God" to be of no account to Himself compared with the salvation of His creatures and children. It was this mind which "thought it not *a thing to be clutched at*," to be clung to (for this is the force of the word translated *robbery*), "to be equal with God." It was in this mind that He took upon Himself the form of a servant, humbled Himself even in that humiliation, became obedient unto death; yes, and even to

the shameful and disgraceful death of the Roman gallows, the death of the cross.

We hear in these words, I say, the catholic Creed. St. Paul cited these great facts of the Godhead, the Manhood, the Passion and Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, not as new and unknown truths which he was teaching for the first time to the Church. The faith is anterior to the preachers of the faith, even to its apostolic teachers. The church at Philippi was a church because it already believed these facts, and made them the reason of its being. St. Paul used the Creed, their own belief, as the text and ground of a lesson which he wanted to bring home to their consciences. This lesson was, "Let the mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus: be you so minded as Christ was minded." In the articles of our belief which we learned in our childhood, and now teach to our children, we confess the Self-discovery of the eternal Mind which was hidden from ages and generations, but is now made known to the simple in Jesus Christ.

III.

I ask you to take strict notice of the use to which St. Paul puts the Creed. Persons demand from us on all sides, What is the use of your creeds? Some tell us that they are dead and worn out. Others tell us that they need to be supplemented by new additions. St. Paul, after stating the apostolic creed, urged the believers to shew its use by really *using* it. He

found that disagreements and quarrels of greater or less eagerness were going on even in a church which had given him so much joy as the church of Philippi. In the first chapter he says that he never recollects this church without joy and thanksgiving. But in the second chapter, a little before the epistle for the day, he shews that there is still a flaw in this joy. First, therefore, he asks them to make themselves such a church as shall "fulfil" his joy. Secondly, he shews them that his fatherly heart is perfectly rejoiced when he sees a church living in *unity*. Thirdly, he points out to them that there can be no abiding unity where there is no resolute and determined *humility*. Fourthly, he points out the only way to humility: it is through *unselfishness* or self-sacrifice —a proved esteem of others above ourselves. Lastly, he shews where this unselfishness is to be studied and learned, where its perfect example is: he shews what a magnificent and wonderful possession it is. It is nothing less than *the Mind of the unseen God* which has been revealed in Christ Jesus, and manifested in all the facts which the Church is joyfully confessing in the Creed—especially in His Incarnation, Passion, and Death as the Son of God and Son of Man.

Thus did the apostle by this chain of gold—unity, humility, unselfishness, the mind of God—bring the Creed into contact with the common daily life of men, and with all those ordinary offences that must needs arise. To heal a disagreement which may in its

origin have been a very petty and paltry one, St. Paul carried up the minds of the Christian people to that Mind by which the widest of all disagreements has been healed. Who would expect to be taken away abruptly from the transient quarrelsomeness and angularity of a few forgotten Christians in a city in Macedonia, and to be winged up at once and without warning into the presence of the very Highest Mystery? Yet this is what the apostle did with the Philippians; this is what his words do with us as we read them. It was his invariable method. Nothing on earth was too mean in his estimation to be left unconnected with the Self-discovery of God in Jesus Christ. He connected the pettiest sin with the greatest mystery of theology. He was not afraid of degrading the Incarnation, Passion, and Sacrifice of the Son of God by bringing them to bear on the acquisition of so trite a virtue or grace as daily unselfishness. On the contrary, he was afraid of employing either of the methods which we probably employ in such cases: he was afraid of using low motives; he was afraid also of uttering a string of empty moral saws—maxims true, perhaps, but quite unable to lay hold of the Christian conscience, because they make no use of its living relation to God and to Humanity in the Mediator Jesus Christ.

We are often tempted to sigh and complain at the increased irreverence and rebellion with which men speak nowadays of the catholic Creeds. Have we not often ourselves to blame? So much of God is given

to men universally in Jesus Christ and His Spirit, that they can everywhere appreciate the ends on earth at which St. Paul was aiming—unselfishness, unity, humility, and the Mind of God in Jesus Christ —that is, the seeking of others' good above our own. Men would scarcely be eager to destroy a faith which they saw to be filling human society with those healing and precious fruits. They would oppose with no great heart a theology which they saw to be nurturing and increasing personal and social morality. When we realize, with the apostle of the Nations, that the acts and habits to which we give trite and commonplace and homely names are nothing less than features of the express likeness of the Mind of God discovered to mankind in the facts of the Incarnation, Passion, and Death of His Son —when we believe that the facts of the Belief make men's common virtues or graces possible—we shall begin again, like him, to commend all the highest mysteries of the catholic faith to the consciences of the Nations. When we preach or hold the Creed as a mere bundle of "articles of religion," we do all we can to restrain its influence to those who from education or bent of mind take an interest in religion. But when we preach the Incarnation, the Passion, the Death, the Resurrection, the Ascension of the Only-begotten Son of God as the foundation of all the commonest morality—as the truths which are needed by man as man, by citizen as citizen, by father as father, by child as child, by master as

master, by thinker as thinker—we are doing all we can to extend the saving influence of the Church to those over whom she has lost all hold, who shout against her in public meetings, who criticize her in newspapers, who ignore her claims in their own lives, who regard her as some strange and even mischievous society exterior to them and to all their thoughts. I do not think that the extension of the influence of the Church is a good thing merely in itself; but I believe it would be the best of all influences if the Church returned to her primitive position as the witness of the Christ who is not only the Head of the Church, but the Head of every man.

IV.

Let us determine, as we follow week after week the doctrinal order of the Church, that no separation shall be made between our theology and our morals. On this day, the first day of "holy week," or of the "great week," we have come to the very heart of that doctrinal order. We enter to-day with Jesus, God and Man, into His lowest humiliation. We behold Him to-day elected King by a universal suffrage, triumphant and apparently successful, the source of joy to thousands upon thousands. We shall follow after Him with the evangelists this week from day to day: we shall trace each day's work and words. We shall see Him passing to and fro between Bethany and Jerusalem—rejected, betrayed, mocked,

scourged, crucified, dead, buried. We shall spend the week in looking at Jesus, in following the steps of His Passion.

But *why?* Is any man the better for the mere believing the facts of the catholic Creed as he believes any fact or facts in the natural kingdom of God? The devils thus believe; and tremble. God is revealed to us (the apostle says to the Church of Philippi, and the Holy Ghost repeats it to-day by the Epistle to many Churches) that we may see what His Mind is, and may have a like mind in us.

> "From pain to pain, from woe to woe,
> To Calvary with Christ we go."

For what end? That we may see what it is in Christ which prompts Him to His Passion; that we may engrave it into ourselves; that we may clothe ourselves with that charity, that unselfishness, that self-sacrifice, that looking upon the things of others above our own things, that only true and perfect godliness or likeness to God which we behold in the passion and death of God's Son.

There was never a time in which it was easier to divorce theology from our own daily acts and habits. The professed secular moralists say with increasing vigour that morality and theology have nothing to do with one another. They would have us clothe ourselves again in the cast-off clothes of Calvinism. Virtue, they tell us, is not grace: it is something independent of God, Whom we preach as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Let us leave off defending our-

selves and begin to blame ourselves. Let us at least ask ourselves, What kind of witnesses of God's mind have we been to the world? What separations have we made between our theology and our every-day life, between God's grace and common virtue? We have so often seemed to care less, we have so often acted and spoken as if the Head of the Church, Christ Jesus, cared less, for eternal things—for liberty, for light, for great human and national movements, for the sanctity of the family and of relationships, for honesty, for truth, for charity between man and man, than for temporal things—for the interpretation of rubrics, the defeat of the parties which oppose us, the saving of clerical property.

Look at a personal specimen in whom theology is divorced from every-day morality. There is a man who is a pattern of behaviour in the house of God, a public defender of the Church's dogma and ritual by tongue and by pen, one who sometimes does good service. He can face and oppose bishops when he thinks they are hinderers of the Church. He comes meekly into his place in choir every morning and evening with folded hands. My brethren, it is suddenly found out that the hands which have written such letters in defence of the doctrine of the Church, the hands which are folded so meekly as he walks in the holy processions, are used in the counting-house for forgery, and used at home for striking his wife. Will not some say, when all is discovered, "What a pity he should have been such a bad hus-

band! He was such a good churchman—such a thorough catholic!"

This is no more than the story, in a modern dress, of every hypocrite. What is the use of introducing the portrait of some hypocrite whom no one in this church will be tempted to imitate? The masks which the hypocrite puts on will always change with the changes of the Church. It is against the least degree of such a horrible inconsistency that the apostle and the Church warn us at our entry into the great week. In this week we see the entire unfolding and disclosure of the innermost recess of the Mind of God. This is the mystery, hidden from past ages, which is shewn us perfectly in the Agony, Passion, Death, and Burial of God's Incarnate Son. We are called to learn the mind that is in Jesus as He enters Jerusalem in triumphant joy on this day, as He "looks round about upon all things" on this night; as on Monday He ejects the sellers from the Temple, and heals the lame and blind in it; as on Tuesday He holds His final controversies with its three antichristian powers—the religious world, the sceptical world, the selfish political world; as on Wednesday He takes His last quiet retirement in the holy home of Bethany; as on Thursday He institutes the Eucharist and is betrayed by Judas; as on Friday He consummates the manifestation of the Mind of God toward wicked men by dying for wicked men.

What is it to be godly? What is it to be

like this God? What is it to have in us the Mind that was in Him in His Incarnation, Passion, and Death? The apostle replies, the catholic Church replies—It is to be unselfish, to sacrifice self, to esteem others better than ourselves, to look on the things of others rather than on our own things. Thus to put away self is the only way of receiving into ourselves the fruit of the Passion, the sound impression and true photograph of the Passion. Thus to conquer self is the only way of entering into Christ's triumph, and rising to new life in Christ. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." This mind is seeking entry into us and into every human creature. Each man was made that he might be its dwelling-place. The only power which resists its entrance is that self, the instruments of whose defeat are shewn to us this week in the passion and cross of Jesus Christ.

XIII.

VICTORY OVER THE WORLD.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

1 JOHN v. 4.

Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.

THIS passage has probably been chosen by the Church for this week's Epistle that we may meditate upon the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and celebrate it at the Eucharist as a victory over "the world." In the Holy Gospel we hear of the sudden appearance of the risen Redeemer in the midst of His disciples, as mighty Victor over the three tyrants of which we all stand more or less in daily terror. The World, Death, and Sin hold us all more or less in bondage. Each is indeed "a Pharaoh, beneath whose cruel tyranny," as the ancient and familiar hymn says, the very apostles were trembling as their fathers trembled in the brick-fields of Egypt. Jesus shews His disciples by His reappearance that each is a beaten foe.

I.

The text, which is the first verse of the Epistle, speaks particularly of one of these beaten foes of our race. The author of "our faith," Jesus Christ, reappeared amongst His disciples as the Conqueror of the World. We must take care what we mean when we call the Son of God a conqueror. When the astonished and glad eyes of His disciples rested upon the living and risen Jesus, they did not see in Him a mere conqueror—like an Alexander or a Napoleon. Jesus was not to them merely the one of two contending powers, who had in the end proved the stronger. They had witnessed already what seemed to be the final trial of strength between Him that was "born of God" and "the world," and in that battle they had seen Him worsted. They had come to think Him the weaker of the two. We need not wonder. Are there not many who readily say that Jesus is He that "is born of God," but shew by their life that they have not the faith which believes Jesus is even now He Who is overcoming the world? The apostles thought that the world—then represented by the Pharisees and Sadducees, Pilate and Herod—was the victor. Men think in the same way now, although they may not like to say it; but it gives them no great grief; it sets them scheming how to get this conqueror's favour and tolerance, how to serve it and Jesus Christ at once.

This misconception about the real victor was,

on the contrary, the very misery of the apostles. All their high hopes for themselves as spiritual creatures, for their noble nation as citizens and patriots, and for mankind as being themselves men, had been looking forward for three wonderful years towards the final issue of the long-undecided conflict of Jesus with the world. As they hurried tremblingly into their room and barred their doors, they felt that the world had not only overcome Him, that was born of God; overcoming Him, it had overcome all that depended on Him; the world had overcome "their faith;" it had overcome those "who believed that Jesus was the Son of God." That glorious vision of the future of the nation and of the race, which had never been absent from their expectation since He called them to follow Him, had been taken from them and from Humanity by His death. They had given up all for Christ, and had got nothing, or, rather, worse than nothing, for they had got fear of the world; fear of seizure by the world as His fellow-blasphemers; fear, perhaps, of death at the world's hands. The earth, now that "the world" had proved itself the earth's master, was no longer to them a place worth living in, and yet they feared to leave it. They met together, but "the doors were shut for fear of the Jews."

When our blessed Lord at evening "came and stood in the midst," they had all heard that He had risen from the dead: some of them had even seen Him. But it seemed as if they were believing His

resurrection as yet to be only a kind of escape from death, or perhaps the reward of His righteousness and goodness. They did not yet perceive in it the sign of the very conquest of death, the sign of the overcoming of that world which seemed to rule the earth and which was holding them captive in terror. They did not perceive that He *must* rise; that Right must triumph over wrong, Good over evil, Humanity over the devil, the Father over the world. The world was even yet to them their actual master, lord, and tyrant, even although they heard that Jesus their Master, Whom it had lately overcome, had marvellously escaped its clutches. They could, perhaps, rejoice that He who meant to be Redeemer had escaped out of the prison in which His foes and mankind's foes thought they had for ever buried Him. They may have indulged a little vague hope: but it could neither be much nor definite. Because the world was still in their experience and view the actual master and ruler over the earth and mankind, they were obliged to manage their faith and their worship and their lives accordingly: when they assembled together, they barred and bolted their doors for fear of the world—"for fear of the Jews." They confessed by their action that the world had overcome them. St. John, who wrote to-day's Epistle, had been witness and partaker of that defeat which he describes in the opening of to-day's Gospel. St. John in a little time by St. Peter's side was to dare this very world at which they then trembled to do its worst:

but he tells us that on this night he had not that apostolic faith which he declares in the text to be the victory which overcomes the world. The apostle did not then entirely believe Jesus Christ to be the Lord, the Conqueror, the Liberator, the Redeemer. No man, he now tells us, can be free of terror of the world, no man can become a conqueror of the world, until this is his faith.

Nothing can be more important to give steadiness to our minds in our own age, and to keep "our faith" whole, than distinct realization what that "world" was by which the apostles were overcome, what that "world" was at which Christ's disciples trembled. "The world," which filled so great place in the apostle's memory and in his theology, is probably the world which, he says in the first sentence of the text, is to be overcome by "*everything* that is born of God," which, he says in the next sentence, is to be overcome by "our faith." The severest charges made against the world in the New Testament are made by this apostle and evangelist. St. John means by "the world" all that is standing forth in opposition to God's revelation of Himself in His Son as the Father of mankind. This is that world before which St. John had once trembled; this is that world which put the Son of Man to death for asserting that He was the Son of God. This world which "lieth in wickedness," as St. John says, is not the common mass of men and women; it is not that greater world, the entire

Humankind summed up in Christ, which God so loved that He sent His Son that not one member of it should perish. The world of the Jews, from whom the disciples cowered in fear behind their barred doors on this Easter-day evening, was not the mass of the Jewish *Nation* as such; the world which had seemed to overcome the Son of God was not even the *mob* which cried out one day, "Blessed be the King," and cried another day, "Crucify Him." The State or Nation may be enslaved by the world; the persons and families who make up a mob may be inspired and used by it: they may be brought into the world's bonds, be made its tools. But mankind, the State, the Family, and the individual Man, are of the Father, and not of the world. The world may spoil a nation, or a family, or a man: it cannot make either. The Father made each man, each family, each nation, to be redeemed from the world: His revelation of Himself began in His successive call and consecration of each of these to Himself. The Family was the first holy foe God raised up against the world; the Nation was the second; the Church the third. He first shewed Himself as Redeemer of mankind by calling out the family in Abram and his son; and next by calling out the nation in the tribes of Israel. The world which stood opposed to the Son of God and Son of Man, the world which had overcome His apostles and disciples, had as its leaders and its organizers *spiritual and religious persons*—pontiffs who sat in Aaron's see, and priests

who possessed a divine vocation and ordination to be the fathers in God of the nation and the liberators and educators of their fellow-citizens, but who had lost all insight into the meaning of their glorious office.

These were the persons who gave the tone and character to that world which fought against Him that was born of God, and thought it had overcome Him; these moved and swayed that world from which the disciples hid themselves in terror on the night of Easter-day. The apostle knew nothing of that modern heresy which regards all spiritual rulers as such as the Church, and all civil rulers as such as the world; which sees in every Caiaphas or Hildebrand or Bonner a man of God, but in every Moses or David, or Alfred or Gustavus, Adolphus a man of the world; which regards a prelate, who is fighting for what is essentially a secular and worldly kingdom, as a holy confessor, but regards a national monarch or statesman, who is bearing witness for God's Kingdom by caring for the utmost redemption and utmost culture of every member of the nation, as a worldly persecutor of the Church. A worldly work is not made a godly work because bishops and priests support it; a godly work is not made a worldly work because statesmen and civil officers contend and labour almost alone for it.

II.

I have already noticed that St. John does not hide the fact from us that when we was himself an actor in the Gospel story, he was in a measure overcome by the world; he confesses that he had in part lost that force which gives the victory over the world. He says in the Epistle that "our faith," that is, the faith of the apostles and of those who believed on their word, is that force. He shows us in the Holy Gospel how he and his brethren regained this faith in all its fulness. It was by the coming of Jesus Christ. It was by the sight of Jesus as He is. They saw Jesus Christ alive. "Jesus came and stood in their midst." The risen Light of man's race drew their attention and contemplation towards Himself as the centre and the explanation of the world's strange history and of their own inward experiences. He made them look toward Him; "He *shewed* unto them His hands and His side." They were "begotten again unto a lively hope," as another who was then present afterwards wrote, "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead."* Hope, I need scarcely say, does not mean in apostolical lips a mere personal expectation of comfort for ourselves; it means the hope for all our kind. The men who had a mission to "all nations" and to "every creature" saw the dead and buried Son of Man to be the Son

* 1 St. Peter i. 3.

of God. They saw the one condemned by the clergy of their nation to be the high priest of humanity. They saw the one punished as a sinner to be the remitter of human sins. They saw the one condemned for blaspheming to be the giver of the Holy Ghost to men. They saw, for the first time, not merely which of the two contending forces in the world-long struggle *had* overcome, but they saw then and there which *must* overcome. They saw not the fact alone, but the everlasting law and principle. Then they began to share in Christ's victory. Then they could begin to share in it, for they began to see that it was their victory, mankind's victory. They began to cast off their burden of fear of the beaten and conquered world. "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world:" this the apostles learned as they looked on the wounded and risen Conqueror. "And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith:" this they realized as the courage and hope arose from the tomb in themselves while they beheld the victorious Son of God in the risen Son of Man.

Faith in Jesus Christ is the end to which the apostle is leading us; but he states the principle of apostolic faith in language marvellously broad and general. He does not say, "Faith is born of God; all the faith which is in men is God's child—it is conceived by the Holy Spirit; faith is so far like Jesus in its origin; faith will be like Him in its issue; faith, though apparently defeated by the world, must at last overcome the world." All this is

true of faith; and it is all implied in what the apostle says. But you will notice that he begins with a far wider range of language when he says, "*Whatsoever* is born of God overcometh the world." Yes, not only faith, but literally "*everything* that is born of God overcomes the world." This is the destiny to which it is by God appointed from the moment of its birth, and by the very fact of its existence. The world may seem to kill it. I say "it," not "Him;" for the word St. John here uses is neuter. It recalls the language of the archangel to the blessed Virgin, in which he speaks of her Son by a neuter and not a masculine name. "That Holy Thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

He whom the Church for so many ages has called "the divine," or "the theologian," who is at once an evangelist and prophet and apostle, gives us the reason of the victory of every true thought and right principle which has affected for good the life of mankind. He gives us the reason why so many great thoughts and principles, long in conflict with the world, denied by the world, and apparently obliterated by the world, have at last triumphed over the world. We may recognise one of these "things born of God," pledged by its origin to be a conqueror, in that noble thought to redeem all races from slavery, which occupied the entire life of the great traveller whose dead body is this week to be buried in the Abbey Church of Westminster.

The pledge of certain victory belongs to every great thought "born of God" in you, young men and maidens, of which "the world" is always eager to despoil you. Do not think it to be too little to become great, because it is now nothing but a thought. Do not think it too great to have a hope of victory. Christ's resurrection is the pledge that it is its very nature and its destiny to overcome the world; if the world drives it out of you, it will appear alive elsewhere. Christ's resurrection is the Father's call upon you not to quench or cast away any of His noble inspirations. The world may bring all its forces to crush the body and soul of the witnesses to "the thing that is born of God;" but they cannot crush it: when they think they have slain it and buried it, it must rise again. The Eternal Son of God, Who was born of God in time, has made it impossible by His victory over the world for any one thing which is born of God to be conquered by the world.

The apostle has not merely told us that this was the faith which made the Church (now so often the drudge of the world) the overcomer of the world; but we know that he acted as he wrote. It is recorded that when St. John and his brethren stood before "the world"—that is, before the worldly prelates and the worldly teachers of the rival religious parties in their nation—they even seemed to make some portion of their fervid faith pass over into their very judges, and take victorious possession of their

minds. When the majority took counsel to slay them, the pharisee Gamaliel stood up and said, "Refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God" (if it be one of those "things which are born of God," and therefore must overcome), "ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

Gamaliel says the same thing as St. John; their conviction is the same, only the words in which they put it forth are different. Where then does the distinction lie between this astute and learned pharisee and the unlearned fisherman? It lies, my brethren, in what the apostle is able to add. Both these children of Israel can say that whatever is born of God must overcome. But the worldly pharisee cannot yet say what is or what is not born of God. He must wait to see. The worldly man of every age and land is one who thinks that the nation and church had far better stay as they are. He finds all things civil and ecclesiastical good enough for him. He is his own measure of what is good and true. He always thinks "things have gone far enough." He is conservatively content to rest. He dares not (as St. John and his fellow-prisoners and fellow-preachers dared) directly put to each of the new thoughts and new movements of his age, "Whence art thou? Who has begotten thee? Bringest thou airs from heaven or blasts from hell?" He has prudence, he has expediency, but he has not that

which St. John calls "our faith." Hence he can have no noble share in the battle, and no full joy in the victory by which "whatsoever is born of God" is ever overcoming the world.

The apostle, unlike the pharisee, treads down all expediency under foot. He fights victoriously because he lives by faith; he can bear his stripes because he can declare to men, and dares to declare, Who and what is born of God, Who and what must therefore be overcoming the world. Who is the Victor? The One Who has entered into fellowship with Humanity, and has abjured the fellowship of the world's parties and sects; the One Who is inspiring every man to resist the world by His presence in our whole Humanity as "the True Light which is enlightening every man." What is it that overcomes? That birth in you and in me which seeks like the apostles fellowship with every creature, and renounces the fellowships which separate us like pharisees from the mass of our kind. The pharisee does not know what persons or what things will gain the victory. The apostle says, "This is the victory that is overcoming the world, even our faith. Who is he that is overcoming the world but he that is believing that Jesus is the Son of God."

XIV.

HUMANITY AND THE CHURCH.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER, MAY 8, 1870.

1 ST. PETER ii. 11, 12.

"Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul; having your conversation honest among the Gentiles: that, whereas they speak against you as evil-doers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation."

THERE is a modern criticism which asserts that the writings of St. Peter and St. Paul are as irreconcilable as the Church parties of the first century wished the two great apostles themselves to be. I do not want to rail at any modern criticism: if it is adverse to the Church, there is every likelihood that the Church ought to take part of the blame. St. Peter himself teaches us this in the epistle. He says that there were hostile critics in the first century, who spoke against the churchmen of the age "as evil-doers:" he shews the churchmen of all ages the apostolic and catholic way of meeting hostile criticism. He told the churchmen of the

first century that they could not expect the unbelievers of that century to glorify God unless the Church's conversation were honest, unless they beheld the Church's good works. He told them and tells us that the will of God has given the Church one sure weapon for silencing the ignorance of foolish men, and that this weapon is not the calling them foolish or ignorant, nor the calling-out for them to be silenced, but is "well-doing." It must always be in the power of the Church to use this weapon, if she is the organ of the Inspirer and Creator of all good.

In the unflattering line thus taken by the Apostle of the Circumcision, and the language in which he puts it forth, we have, I think, some indication of the real unity of doctrine between himself and the Apostle of the Nations. What does each apostle consider as the end of his apostleship? That the Nations may glorify God in the day of visitation. St. Peter finds no more contentment in the mere existence of the Church than St. Paul finds. He, like St. Paul, regards the Church as catholic; that is, as implicitly co-extensive with the entire Humankind. The Church is incomplete until every man is also a churchman. As an apostle from God, St. Peter was sent to preach the gospel to every creature; but as a church-ruler he claimed no jurisdiction over any creature who was not within the Church. He had jurisdiction over those to whom he wrote, and who had freely submitted their wills to apostolic rule—the pilgrims of the dispersion of Pontus,

Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. But what was the use St. Peter made of his authority as ruler and teacher of these dispersed churchmen? He recalled the churchmen themselves to the end of their being churchmen—the end of the will of God in separating them from mankind—an end which God by His government of the Gentiles makes clearer and clearer as the world grows older. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light."

The carnal man in the churchman no doubt thought then, as it thinks now, that a man is made a churchman that he may be what he calls saved. "Whatever becomes of the Gentiles, or whether God is praised or ignored by the rest of the world," says the old Adam within us, "we must get ourselves saved." St. Peter, in writing to the Church, had not only the true good of churchmen at heart, but also that greater and more catholic good for which men are made into churchmen—the glorifying of God by the Gentiles, that is, by all as yet outside the Church, by all the Nations of the Humankind. His mission as an apostle was to "all Nations" and to "every creature." He used his authority as one of the rulers of the Church with a regard to this mission, as a means of fulfilling it. It was to bring the world to God that St. Peter wrote to the Church: "Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and

pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul; having your conversation honest among the Nations: *that, whereas they [are speaking] against you as evil-doers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation.*"

The Church stands in a twofold relation to Humanity. We have often considered this fact together, from sayings of St. Paul. In the Epistle for this week St. Peter sets forth each side of the relation, with its consequent obligation. We shall discern some features of this relation, I believe, in each of the Eucharistic Epistles for this period of the forty days during which the Risen Lord was speaking with the apostles concerning the kingdom of God.

The Church is at once separated from mankind, and yet at the same time united to mankind. First, The Church is separated from mankind. The churchmen are taken out of mankind by their election, calling, baptism. Our separation is a Divine act. It is God who has separated us (i. 1—3). We are, St. Peter tells us, "strangers and pilgrims." We are in the world, and yet in this sense not of it; we are in it, but passing through it. It is not our lasting country; it is but our road to it. Our consequent obligation is, St. Peter adds, to "abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul."

Secondly, The Church is united with mankind. Our union as the true Israel with the Gentiles, as the "holy nation" with all nations, as churchmen with all men, is as divine an act as our separation from

them. It is God who has united us. He has united us in nature by gathering us again into one new Adam, or new father of all men—His Son Christ Jesus. By His one flesh, as St. Paul says, He has broken down the partition which divided mankind into the Jews and the Nations. God has united the Church with Humanity also by the very *end* of the Church's being. Why is this universal society of human creatures, this Church, being formed by God out of the mass of His human creatures? We need not go for an answer to St. Paul. St. James tells us, in one of these Easter-tide Epistles, the end of our being churchmen—"That we should be" (not the whole harvest, but) "a kind of first-fruits of His creatures."

It is to the Church, as the first-fruits of God's harvest of Mankind, that St. Peter here speaks. God has not only given the human race to His Son as Head of the Church, that out of it He may form a Catholic Church, but He has given the Church to His Son as the new Adam of the whole race, that through the human and godly life exhibited in and by the Church all men may be drawn toward God and "glorify Him." Jesus Christ, as "the Head of every man," claims the Church for mankind. The Church belongs to man. The heathen, the Gentiles, the unbelievers, have a property in the catholic Church. The Church is mankind's, as all the works of God are, as the earth is, as the sun is, as the air is—only far more completely. Jesus Christ at the same time, as "the Head of the body, the Church,"

claims mankind for the Church. He gave "all Nations" to her, He gave her "every creature," as His last gift before His ascension. The Church and Mankind are thus so bound together in one in the common Headship of Christ Jesus over each, that it is impossible to say which is most and which is least completely the property of the other. To this unity St. Peter refers when he says to the Church, You are "having your conversation among the Nations." He brings forward the awful obligation which by this unity God has laid upon the Church, when he adds, Let your life in the midst of the Gentiles, and your fellowship with them, be "honest: that, whereas they speak against you as evil-doers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation. Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake."

I.

It is of this unity of the catholic Church with the whole Humanity, of the oneness of the elect and separated Israel with all Gentiles, in Jesus Christ the common Head of both, that I wish chiefly to speak. But I must follow St. Peter's order, and speak first of our separation as churchmen, or Christian men, from other men. You, St. Peter says to all churchmen, are "strangers and pilgrims." Your duty, he says, is to "abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul." This is only a part of that which the great

apostle has to say to the Church; and yet this part is the whole conception which many of us have as yet formed of our relation to the human race, and of our consequent duty as churchmen toward God. There can be no duty to God which does not include duty to all mankind, for God and all mankind are indissolubly one in Him who has made us to be the Church. We cannot know God apart from Humanity: for we cannot know God except in the Epiphany of God, Jesus Christ, and He includes in Himself not only all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, but the universal entirety of the Manhood.

Suppose that a christened man is asked, Why are you a churchman? He may give antiquarian answers to the question. But if he is dealt with more closely, he will not improbably answer, "I am a churchman that I may save my own soul." I will only hint in passing that much of the self-seeking and self-centred activity loosely called "the saving of the soul" is often the damning of the soul. So the soul's Saviour has plainly declared. But suppose that the churchman answers, almost in St. Peter's own words: "I am a stranger and a pilgrim that I may abstain from fleshly lusts which war against my soul." Is this a right estimate of the Christian?

Do you not see that if St. Peter had closed his practical exposition of the relation of the Church to Mankind at this point, he would have been a pharisee, and not a catholic apostle? He might indeed have been founder and head of a world-wide Sect; he might

have accepted that papacy to which the Judaising party in the Church wished to exalt him; but he could not have been a pillar of a catholic Church founded by the new Head of the human race for "all Nations" and for "every creature." The beginning of our battle as churchmen for God, and for all our brethren who are not yet in the Church, must indeed be fought within us, as St. Peter beseeches us to realize; it must be waged against an enemy which the churchman himself carries with him wherever he goes. A "good churchman" must "abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul." Unless we are conquerors in this inward warfare, we can do little for the glory of God, that is for the good of those who are not yet in the Church. "The soul" and "the selfish lusts" are never on equal terms. Either the soul is the conqueror, and the selfish lusts are abstained from as rebellious traitors; or else the selfish lusts are conquerors, and the soul is their slavish prisoner and drudge. If my selfish lusts hold me as their prisoner, and lead me hither and thither where they will, there is too little difference between me and the worst sort of unbeliever for any unbeliever to care to become the kind of believer I am. I am separated from the world to "shew forth the praises of God. But if I am the slave of selfish lusts —living for pleasures, living in sleepy thoughtlessness, having no end in life but my own satisfaction in this world or the next world—there is too little difference between me and those who do not glorify

God to make them care to "glorify Him." St. Peter had learned in his own person the lesson he teaches: "When *thou* art converted," the Lord said to him, "strengthen thy brethren."

II.

The apostle, however, does not merely speak to individual Christians, but to a society or group of societies. "Having *your* conversation honest among the Gentiles." We do not only produce a personal impression upon our immediate neighbours, but there is a general impression made upon a Nation by the contemporary Church, which is the product of the social conduct of the Church. It is the traditional as well as the critical belief that the Christian societies to which St. Peter wrote were composed of Jews and proselytes. St. Peter, in that case, cites a well-known fact. The Gentiles did speak against the Jews, and had good cause for doing so. Jews were always boasting of their freedom as the circumcised of God, and using this "liberty as a cloak of maliciousness;" making it an excuse for not honouring all men, for not honouring Gentile kings.* The meanest Jew fancied himself to be a greater man in God's sight than Cæsar himself: he expected, when his Messiah came, to be a greater man in the world's sight. He was always ready for rebellion, always refusing to submit, because the free man of God, to this or that "ordinance of man."†

* ii. 16, 17. † ii. 13.

But we call St. Peter's letter to these Jewish Christians a catholic epistle. He still speaks in it to the churchmen of every nation and time. We are amongst those whom he addresses as "strangers and pilgrims," as "having our conversation among the Nations." "The Gentiles" who speak against us as evil-doers are those who are to-day outside the Church, but who come in contact with us in our common life. The apostle does not say whether the charge was, in the first century, true or false. He only says that the charge was being made. We may soon find that it is also being made in our age and country, and very loudly and persistently, if we look into the newspapers which do not agree with our views, or if we go into any society in which churchmanship is not a predominating element. A few churchmen stand almost alone in a warehouse, in a political assembly, in ordinary society. It is a splendid position. There they stand, separated by God from their fellows amongst whom they "have their conversation," but separated to the end that their fellows "may by their good works, which they shall behold, glorify God." Some of us have found ourselves in this position; some, no doubt, are now in it. That we may fulfil its great end, God has laid two labours upon us: first, abstinence from our own "fleshly lusts;" secondly, the maintenance of that "honest conversation" which St. Peter expounds and divides into its parts in the remainder of his letter.

Those who are outside the Church speak against

you who are in the Church, says the apostle, as evil-doers. "Yes," we perhaps hasten to reply; "we are perfect martyrs—are treated as criminals. Our parents, our friends, our companions, mock us and thwart us. The confession, the early eucharist, the visiting the church on a week-day, the observance of an ecclesiastical fast are spoken of as if they were crimes or intolerable follies." "No," St. Peter and all Christ's martyrs reply, "you are not yet martyrs." The martyr is a witness for God; but he is a witness for that God Who is one with Mankind. The martyr is no witness to himself and to his showy unlikeness to other men, but to a relationship which belongs to him because it belongs to men. The very first martyr—in whose name this church is dedicated—was murdered by a religious world for bearing witness that the whole human world was the object of God's love.

Is it wonderful that the Gentiles, the Nations in whose midst the Church is living and conversing, should misunderstand the Church? The contrast between a catholic believer and an unbeliever is not indeed so great in England in our day as it was in Asia Minor in the first century. Still, it is striking enough. You may see how striking it is by a glance at the magazines or newspapers which profess to be organs of "the thought" of this century. "These men who speak of a Man who is God, of a resurrection from the dead, of miracles, of sacraments, of God forgiving sins," they say, "do not belong to this

country and this age. They converse with us. They are our brothers, friends, partners. These men who say to other men, 'I absolve thee,' these men who believe them, were at school with us. We know what they were in the nursery, in the class, in the playground. Their whole tone of thought and language is utterly *foreign* to us. They have their conversation among us, but yet they are, indeed (we quite agree with the fisherman of Galilee) 'strangers and pilgrims!'" You know, my brethren, how it is with a crowd intent on its business or its pleasure, which sees foreigners or pilgrims passing through it—men separated from the crowd by a different language, by manner, by habit, by an evidently different object; they are in the crowd, but they are passing through it, they are not of it. The self-satisfaction of a mob, "the ignorance of foolish men," * usually breaks out into scorn, or pity, or wonder, or laughter, at the sight of a man oddly or unusually dressed. The narrow man is the "foolish man." Whatever be his attainments in science, or goods, or power, he thinks every man a fool who is not exactly like himself. He is generally a prisoner in the narrow cell of one of those "worlds" which the inhabitants of them substitute for the great human world which God loves and has redeemed. It is not improbably his profession that he is first a scientific man and then a man, first a philosopher and then a man, first an artist and then a man, first a tradesman and then a man, first

* ii. 15.

an artisan and then a man, first a catholic and then a man, even first a christian and then a man.

The foolish staring of a mob or the self-satisfied criticism of "a world" is but a feeble image of the mingled surprise, contempt, and dislike with which the Gentiles of the first century must have scrutinized the believers in Christ Jesus scattered here and there amongst them, the mean and unlikely leaven which God had cast among the Nations for their leavening. They had but one question to decide concerning them. "These men believe the Galilean whom Pilate punished by the gibbet at Jerusalem to be the Son of God and the Founder of a universal Kingdom: are they fools, or are they bad men?" St. Peter says that in his age, at all events within the districts of which he was speaking, the Gentiles gave this answer, "They are evil-doers." The apostle addresses himself to correct this ill report. We can hardly fail to see the unlikeness of St. Peter's method to that of the modern defenders of the faith and of the Church. They would probably say, "The Gentile unbelievers are in the wrong; despise their calumnies: God will vindicate you, the members of His holy Church." But the apostle of Jesus Christ appears to care as much for the Nations as for the Church; or rather he cares for the Church so much because he cares more for the Gentiles, and knows that the Church of which he is a ruler and teacher exists only for the benediction of the whole Humanity to which he is God's apostle. "It is indeed an evil,"

the apostle said to them and says to us, "that they who are not churchmen should call you who are churchmen "evil-doers." Whether the charge be true or false is a great but still a secondary matter. Whether it pains you as men, or pleases you as vain pharisees, is a secondary matter. It keeps *them* from glorifying God as their Father, their Saviour, their Teacher; it keeps them alien from Him Whose witnesses and representatives you are made unto them: this is the bitter evil."

The ghastly pseudo-Peters of the Vatican scold the Gentiles for the division between them and the Church. But the true St. Peter, full of faith, believed that the Church held the cure of the evil. Like a true father in God he corrected his own children. In the whole remainder of his epistle he unfolds before them their business and obligation as churchmen. "You must have your conversation honest among them." You must be more thorough citizens than the Gentiles are. You ought to enter more manfully and humanely into all that concerns mankind, the people, or the family, than they can enter. Your love for truth and reality in politics, in commerce, in social life, ought to transcend theirs. You must be more perfect husbands, fathers, children, servants, masters, neighbours, than they are. Your baptism has only separated you from Humanity that it may rebind you to Humanity, as you would not be bound until you had become a member of the mystical body of the New Adam of the whole race. Whatever possible

good can it be that you should be a churchman, unless it is making you more *a man* than ever you were able to be until you were a christened man? The Nations must "behold"—they have received from the Head of the whole race, from the Saviour of the whole world, a right to behold—"your good works." They have a divine right to introspect your works, to examine them through and through. If the works of the Church are good, then all nations and every creature—as truly created and redeemed for God's good end as the Church is—will "glorify God in the day of visitation."

If there be any true interpretation of the mind of St. Peter in what I have said, you must see a denial and not a development of his teaching in such infidel and uncatholic sayings as those that are so often uttered in modern Nations by men who profess a reverence and obedience toward St. Peter second only to their reverence and obedience toward the Son of Man. Our Risen King has given us no clearer sign that He has done with nobles as rulers of the Nations than the wonderful flood of noblemen who have rushed as converts to the steps of that papal throne which has become the forlorn hope of nationless kings and other ghostly and defeated forces of the time. It is a sign that the kingdom of the Son of Man is making progress in human politics when a nobleman's power depends upon his being a noble *man*. It has been the secret of the stability of our English nobility that in no age has the nation wanted noblemen who

were first of all men. But one of the crowd of papist nobles the other day proclaimed himself to England as "a Catholic first, and an Englishman afterwards." We know what he means by "a Catholic"—one who believes that St. Peter is unspeaking in the nineteenth century, by the mouth of the Roman bishop, every thing which he spoke and wrote in the first century by the Holy Ghost.

But is there not amongst us a secret suspicion that the Church exists in some way mainly for her own good and her own glory, and not for the glorifying God, that is, for the universal good of "the Gentiles" —the greatest possible liberty and wisdom and virtue of every nation, every family, and every man? Are not the Gentiles of this day often justified in regarding us "as evil-doers"—that is, as those who prefer some good in which we differ from our brethren to the universal good? Those outside the Church may say even of us: 'These selfish fellows are strangers here; they do not care for this dear common land, for these dear homes, for this dear people, so much as they care for treasures in another world which *they* are to have, but in which we and the mass of their brethren are to have little or no share.' When we are "spoken against as evil-doers" we must not console ourselves with the illusion that the charge is a proof of our heavenly-mindedness. Our keen critics may further say: 'These fellows care as much for something in this world as we do. But what they chiefly care for here is the progress of a quasi-universal club of which

they are members, and whose supposed interests in money and dignities and power are more precious to them than the freedom and the culture of the Nations to which they belong by the divine ordination of their birth and language.'

St. Peter only echoes the charge which the Lord had already given to his brethren and himself, "Let your light so shine before men, that *they* may glorify your Father." "Out of your good works, which they shall behold," the apostle promises, "they shall glorify God in the day of visitation."* Do not, therefore, grudge your good works to men because you think they give such bad works to you. Do not make conditions with the Gentiles, that if the State will do good to you, you will do good in its midst. Do not preach to the Nations that they will glorify the Father if they yield to His clergy whatever conditions they demand of them—that they shall favour the Church in legislation, that they shall never interfere with clerical property, that in their laws of marriage or of education they shall give some unjust and therefore ungodly indulgence to citizens who are churchmen which they refuse to citizens who are not churchmen. No man should labour so hard as the churchman against every such evil. To set up injustice or favouritism in any sphere of life can be no real help to the Church. The Church is the representative of the Righteous God, and it is the end of her being to make Nations and souls more righteous. Her

* Acts i. 17, 33.

punishment must be terrible if she abuses her position and her powers to oppose and decrease the righteousness with which the Spirit of God is already convincing mankind apart from the Church. It was St. Peter who bore witness on the very first day of the Church's existence, that the ascended Son of Man had poured out His Spirit upon the entirety of Humanity.

XV.

CHRIST'S ASCENSION AND UTILITY: THE THINGS ABOVE ARE THE THINGS NEEDED ON THE EARTH.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION, MAY 25, 1873.

COLOSSIANS iii. 2.

"*Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth.*"

FEW persons can be altogether ignorant that advice, which seems to be very opposite to the advice of the Christian apostle, is being uttered every day more urgently and widely in Christian lands. "Set your affections," say these modern apostles, on those solid "things on the heart, which you know to exist. Do not be so cruel to mankind and to yourselves as to set your affections on some imagined things above, of whose existence you cannot have any tangible material proof."

I.

The leading men who offer this advice to us in our day cannot be called "worldly men." If they were worldly men their teaching would scarcely be re-

garded with so much respect as it is. Most of us, I believe, demand the character of unworldliness from any teacher who professes to call upon us to embrace unrecognised truth, even though what he teaches us as the truth may be the cold dogma that no things are worthy the attention of men who live on the earth except "things on the earth." Some of us may perhaps have met persons calling themselves secularists or positivists, whose character could not be more fitly described than by the quality "unworldly."

When I speak of a worldly man I certainly mean a man who is determined during the present day to force all the use and enjoyment he can out of the things upon the earth. But I am sure that such a man is likely to be at the same time taking some thought for the morrow, and using the most astute precaution to secure a hold—when the things on the earth shall slip from his grasp—upon those still more useful and enjoyable things which he believes or reckons to exist somewhere else. Such a man acts out the positive half of the advice of the apostles of secularism. He sets his affections on things on the earth. But, by refusing to take the negative half of their advice, he may be shewing that he is far more prudent and calculating than they are. He does not see any inconsistency in taking half their advice and refusing to take the other half, in setting his affections at the same time on things which are not on the earth and on things which are on the earth.

What a man's action is, his belief will be. "Shew

me thy faith," says the apostolic moralist, "by thy works." The worldly man, whether religious or irreligious, must half believe the secularist counsel to be wise; he must at least believe it to be very prudent. A worldly man is one who does not make what he calls "fine distinctions:" he holds prudence and wisdom to be two names for one thing. But the worldly man of our age and nation does not as a rule approve of secularism as a confession. He not only thinks religion to be a good investment for commercial nations and for money-making men, but he reckons it best to be prepared for the alternative of the negative half of the dogma of secularism proving untrue. Lest there should prove to be "things above" which are better than the best things on the earth, lest there should also prove to be things below which are more horrible than the worst things on the earth, he adds "other-worldliness" to his worldliness. An unworldly secularist may "set his affections" solely on securing the triumph of right and goodness on this earth. A zealous ascetic may set his affection solely on securing within himself an inward righteousness and goodness of which he sees no visible pattern existing upon the earth. The worldly man will care little for either of these aims; he will try to secure for himself all things which he thinks worth getting, whether they are the things on the earth or the things above the earth. He is free from the torments which consume each of the others. He does not fret and wear away his life, like some

profoundly unworldly secularist, in self-sacrificing care to effect a solid goodness and righteousness in the present world. He does not disturb his ease, like some unworldly ascetic, by waging inward battle against the wickedness and unrighteousness which plague him in himself. He hopes that he is performing a feat which the apostle held to be impossible. He sets his affections on things above, and also on things on the earth.

The word "affections" has perhaps come to have amongst us a lower meaning, or at least a more restricted meaning, than it had with our forefathers in the age of Elizabeth and James I. By the three English words "Set your affections" our translators sought to represent the one single Greek word which was used by St. Paul.* They have englished the very same word in other parts of St. Paul's writings, as "think," as "regard," as "understand," and as "mind."† St. Paul wrote these words to a society "on the earth," which had no reason for existence unless Humanity has an unseen Head and Lord beyond the earth. The members of the Colossian Church had been called out from amongst their Colossian fellow-citizens to bear witness that the ascended Son of God and Son of Man was "above," that He was caring for the earth as none on the earth could care for it, and was reigning over it and guiding it to its glorious end. St. Paul therefore said to them, "*Mind* the

* φρονεῖτε.

† Rom. xii. 3, 16; xiv. 6; 1 Cor. xiii. 11; 2 Cor. xiii. 11, &c.

things above; *think* of the things above; *regard* the things above; or, *understand* the things above." He sought to lead upward, not so much what we now call the affections as the reason and understanding of Christ's members to those things or affairs with which Christ the Head is for ever engaged. He urged these men to care for those affairs for which the perfect Man is caring. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Mind ye the things above, not the things on the earth."

These words, as you will perhaps remember, are now used by the Church as the Epistle for Easter-day. But we can scarcely find anywhere fitter words for meditation in the Ascension season, for by them the apostle leads the Church onward from our Lord's Easter to His Ascension—its necessary sequel. It is not enough for us who are the chosen witnesses of the Risen One to go back and look into the empty tomb "on the earth." It is not enough to mind the things which Christ has done for us, has done for all men. It is not enough to say with gladness and relief, as we perceive our dead one to be alive, our condemned one to be accepted by God, our buried one to be risen, We are justified. Men must look upward to the living Son of Man. We must regard and mind the "things above" which our King is at this moment doing, the business of the Father with which the Son of God is now occupied, the business of Humanity with which the Son of Man is now busy.

II.

The essential question therefore is this: What *are* the "things above" which St. Paul tells us we ought as church-members to be minding? What are the affairs above which each Christian ought to set before him as the object of his thinking? The apostle does not leave us to guess what they are, to imagine what Christ's business is. It is indeed no unnatural or improbable guess that there do exist somewhere or other out of the conditions of earth far better things and a far grander business than any of the things or any of the businesses on the earth. It is no very monstrous supposition that eager men who scan the heavens for their secrets, nay, that the very beggars whose earthly life depends upon a supermundane sun, are concerned in a business which is going on above and beyond the earth. But an apostle would be no apostle if he could merely offer us probabilities and suppositions. His title is a farce unless he is an officer who is *sent* to men. St. Paul believed that he was commissioned to deliver a wonderful and gladdening message to "all Nations" and to "every creature" "on the earth." He had no doubt that every one who minded and understood this message would receive it as indeed good news to men on the earth. But he would have been no proclaimer of a gospel if his message had been nothing better than the lecture of a Christian Evidence Society. An apostle does

not say, There may be "things above;" there may be a heaven; there may be a God; there may be a hell. St. Paul does not argue that there may be a Father; that there may be access for men to Him through a Son of God Who is the Son of Man; that signs and miracles may have been wrought by which the Son showed that the Father is absolute Lord of the unseen forces and atoms of the universe. He does not argue that there may at this moment be a Head and a Firstfruits of the Humankind reigning from above over all that is below, and pledged to bring the universe into a better order than the most sanguine secularist dares to dream for it. He says plainly when speaking of the "things above," "Christ is sitting above." The "things above" are the things "where Christ sitteth." Know Jesus Christ, and you will know what those things are. The business above must be that business at which the Head of Humanity is busy.

Christ's apostle does not hint that we can draw sufficient matter from a comparison of religions to conjecture what the things above may be. Every religion has made a heaven. It has imagined here on earth, from what men have seen here or wanted to see here, a sphere of things above; its heaven is just the kind of place and state in which the believers of that religion, or the men asked to believe it, would like to find themselves; it is the perpetual prolongation and the hugely magnified reflection of their own happiest dreams. It is for them. It is not for

Humanity; its centre is not the Son of Man. It is characterized also by the absence from it of whatever they dislike on earth. The savage expects to find "the things above" to be dogs to follow him and beasts for him to hunt.

But Christ's apostle tells us that we must condition or rather must enlarge all our thoughts about the things above by connecting them with the faith once delivered to the saints, with the theology of the Gospel. It was by the introduction of this theology that the apostles scattered the inventions and surmises of mere religions. If we wish to mind the things above, to have any practical understanding of them, to contemplate them with our reason and not with our mere lusts, we must connect them with an ascended Son of Man. We shall not begin to think of them rightly until we think of them solely as "those things where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God." St. Paul does not describe the things above. He simply denotes them by the simplest and yet most universal word which human language possesses.* The English word "things" was used by our translators to represent the simple plural article which St. Paul's disciple used to render the words of our blessed Lord to the Virgin and St. Joseph, "Know ye not that I must be about my Father's *business?*"†

* τὰ (*ἀνω*). Luther has, "*Was* (droben ist)." The Vulgate, *Quæ* (sursum sunt).

† S. Luke ii. 49, ἐν τοῖς (*του Πατρός μου*). Luther, *In dem* (das ist meines Vaters).

The "things above," therefore, are one and the same with the "Father's business." That which the Son was once doing in men's sight on the earth, He is still doing in the unseen world. Business, in the highest sense of that noble word, is the end which the secular moralist sets before us, and to which he would have us give ourselves when he entreats us as wise men to mind only the things on the earth. To set our mind upon the things above is to set our mind upon the present work of the Son of Man. We do not think of the real "things above" until we think first of the doer of those things—the Man who is above. If we are regarding heaven apart from the ascended Saviour of the world, and merely in relation to our own hopes and fears, we are like pagans, and our minds are paganised. We are not regarding the actual things now above, but some things which we hope hereafter to find above.

A great many persons think of Ascension-tide as a kind of other-worldly season. By the narrow incompleteness of our preaching, and the utter want of Humanity in it, we have no doubt given them many excuses for thus thinking of it. Every man is able to connect in some way or other Christ's birth, Christ's moral teaching, Christ's martyr-death, Christ's human burial, with the actual history and real wants of men upon this earth. Every Christian can do more. He is able to connect Christ's miracles and Christ's resurrection in some way or other with the outward and inward struggles going on in the world and in the

mind. But are we not inclined to think of Christ's ascension as an act altogether foreign to our common and every-day wants? Does not the idea of a right hand of God and a super-mundane throne on which Christ sits in some invisible sphere which we call "above" seem to remove Him out of the sphere of actual human sympathies? We may still call Him, as we think of Him sitting there, "the Son of Man." But this may be to us merely one of the biblical "titles of Christ," upon which we possess so many wearisome books. Have we not a suspicion that there is something not merely superhuman but even contra-human in His ascension? Do we not think of His ascension as lifting up the Son of Man into the midst of mysterious "things above," with which we sons and daughters of men have nothing or little to do here and now, with which we shall first really have to do when by dying we have ceased to have to do with this earth and this life? Have we not connected Christ's ascension and session at the Father's right hand with what we call rest much more than with what we mean by "business"? We regard Him as the sufferer for righteousness Who is now being rewarded. We regard Him as the hero Who has triumphed, and is now enjoying His well-earned ease. We regard Him as the Son of God, Who is now proved to have been not a mere man. We regard Him as the pledge of the comfort and enjoyment which some men may have hereafter, rather than as the sign what Humanity now is and what each man

now ought to be and to do "on the earth." We regard Him perhaps as the busy representative and advocate of certain men or certain sects on the earth, whose fullest hope and longing is to be safely rid of the earth—men and sects who care the least about the doing of a perfect will in the earth, and the coming of a perfect kingdom upon the earth. Do we regard Him as the present sign what Humanity is, as the Word of God telling us what we ought to be, as the Son of God shewing us what ought to be our "business" as men? Is not the suspicion of the positivist about the ascension, the charge of the secularist against the unpractical nature of faith in a Son of Man ascended out of the earth into the midst of things above the earth, fundamentally one and the same with the practical belief, or rather unbelief, of us Christians? Do we so think of the heavenly "things which are above, where Christ is sitting," as to connect them with the images of heavenly things which occupy us here below? Do we connect the Son's duty to the Father with all the common and daily duties which bind us who are living here below, with all our divine obligations as citizens, neighbours, kinsmen, masters, servants? Do we connect the heavenly life of the Conqueror of human evils with all the evils in and around us which make it so hard to do our common and daily duties here on the earth? Do we think that "the Head of every man" above is caring for every man below?

I have asked plenty of questions. I must send you

to St. Paul's letter that you may see how he has anticipated them and provided answers for them. If you look at the rest of this chapter, and indeed at the whole remainder of this letter to the Church of Colosse, you cannot miss seeing why the apostle of Jesus Christ spoke to the Church of Christ's Ascension and Christ's session, why he urged the christened witnesses of the ascended and enthroned Lord and Son of Man in the first century to lift up their reason and understanding to "the things above." You will see that it was not that they might become possessed of a greedier lust for future happiness. You will see that was not that he might sharpen the natural Pagan appetite for Elysian fields, or the natural Jewish appetite for Abraham's bosom. You will find that it was not that he might train them to an ascetic depreciation of the relationships which they held with their brethren and neighbours in the city of Colosse.

St. Paul desired those Greeks of Asia, and the Spirit of Christ Who spoke by him desires us Christian Englishmen, to "set our affections on things above," for the very same reasons for which every noble-minded positivist and secularist of our generation urges us not to set our affections upon things that may or may not be above, but upon the things that certainly are upon the earth. He tells us to look up to One Who is not living and working for Himself above, but is living and working for the utmost redemption and culture of the entirety of our wretched and sinful Humanity. He urges us as the sealed members of

Christ's body so to look up to our Head and the Head of every man, so to think of the things with which He is now occupying Himself, that we may save ourselves from those evil "things on the earth" and within ourselves which are hindering us from doing our common and daily duty as men and women. We are to mind the "things above," the apostle tells us, in order that we may be saved from giving over our own minds to such "things on the earth" as he catalogues from the fifth to the ninth verse—fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, covetousness which is idolatry, anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of our mouth, and lying one to another. The apostle of the ascended King calls in turn, just as the most earnest of secular legislators might do, upon wives, upon husbands, upon children, upon parents, upon servants, upon masters.* He calls upon them as persons holding such relations, not as persons to whom such relations are of secondary importance. It is true that he calls upon them to mind the things above, where Christ is sitting. But Who is Christ? He is the Man; He is the source of life and light to all who are human. He is the Lord of each, the ideal of each, the brother and fellow of each. He brings forward their relation to Christ, just as the most serious secular moralist might bring forward his axioms of conduct, not that he may make them more fearful of losing a place above with Christ hereafter, but that he may

* iii. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22; iv. 1.

make them more conscious of the splendour and the awfulness of the duties which lie upon them here and now "on the earth" as Christ's members, more careful to fulfil the business given to them as members of Humanity, members of a city, members of families in this life and on this earth. Nothing can be more plain to the sincere reader of St. Paul's letter than that it was not written to point the way to get to heaven, but the way to bring heaven "on the earth." We may have dehumanized the ascension of the Son of Man by our way of speaking of it; we may have made it look like the most unpractical of doctrines. But, as the apostle preached it, it was quite as practical, and had as clear an affinity with our life in this earth, as any of the theories by which the political or social theorist is scheming or hoping to make us (perhaps in spite of ourselves) better men or better citizens, better neighbours or better kinsmen. The apostle of the world's Liberator appeals to the will in us to which He has given freedom. He tells us that His Spirit is working with us to will and to do; and he urges us to make ourselves at once better without waiting for better conditions.

III.

I cannot be content with saying that the apostolic gospel is quite as practical and quite as useful for the economist's own purpose as anything which the social or political thinker urges us to accept in its

stead. But I shall now say—I should have no function amongst men if I did not say it—that I believe the gospel of Jesus Christ which tells us to mind things above is much more practical and more useful for the economist's own confessed ends in this life than all the social or political thoughts or measures which they would give mankind in the place of it. To do his *duty* in that state of life unto which he is called, to be what he ought to be—what he owes to be—both the old English catechism and the most thoroughgoing of secularists agree in declaring to be the immediate and necessary work of every man in the world. Nay, the Church declares this to be most specially the duty of those children of men who have been taught they are children of a Father above, members of a Head Who is above, inheritors of a kingdom which is above. I can only say that the word "duty" and the word "ought" would fill many of us with hopeless perplexity and confusion if we need not believe that there is any Person to Whom all men owe the due of duty to other men, any Person Who has the right to say to either of us that he ought to be or to do this, or ought not to be or to do that. If each man's state of life be (as the Church Catechism says) a vocation or calling into which the Father and Lord of all has called him, it is not so hard to think of its right activities as duties, as the acts and habits which are *due* to Him who placed us in it, as acts and habits which He the Father has a right to expect from each child for the sake of all His family,

the Lord from each servant for the sake of all His household, the Man from each man and woman for the sake of His whole Humanity.

To do our duty on this earth we need to "set our affections on" an invisible object, to have some regard and some understanding of an ideal which certainly does not exist "on the earth." The lives of self-sacrificing and dutiful men who thought that there were no ideal "things above," or who feared that there were none, afford no exception to this rule. Where can we look for the example of a nobler life, in regard to utter self-sacrifice for the good of mankind, than in that life which God has so lately taken from this world? The secularist apostles tell us that in the life of such a man as John Stuart Mill, and in many similar lives, we may see how nobly those men can do their duty whose ideal seems to be wholly set amongst things on the earth. They wish to make their own Nation a better and more righteous Nation; they profess to have no higher aim; they think indeed that there can be no higher. I deny that the ideal of such men does exist upon this earth. Certainly they never saw it here. They hoped, waited, and laboured for its revelation and appearance. I deny that the affections of such noble men are the same as the affections of the worldling. I deny that their minds are set on things upon the earth. I cannot dare to call the generous benefactors of the world "worldly" or "earthly-minded" men. Such men live, and write,

and labour, and deny themselves ease and the idle use of fortune; they welcome misrepresentation, and endure throughout their lifetime the hatred and suspicion of worldly respectability, and even sometimes face death willingly, in the hope that their ideal may some day be brought into existence, that it may become one of the things upon the earth. With this generous end in view, the late Mr. Mill from a man of books became a man of active parliamentary life. You will remember the outcry which broke forth against him as a practical politician. Many respectable worldlings, whose affections are set on the predominance of their class and their interests upon the earth, only suspected him so long as he was supposed not to worship the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; but they began to hate him and abuse him when they perceived that his affections were set on the things above where the Son of Man is sitting—I mean the things of Humanity, and of every human creature in the earth, man or woman. They were vexed that he did not seem to worship God; but they were enraged when they discovered that he would not worship their idols. The language applied to him by some of the journals of the religious world is exactly the kind of language which must have been employed by the religious world of Jewry after the death and execution of the Son of Man, or after the murder of His first witness unto death.*

* I give a specimen without naming the newspaper. "His insolence to, and contempt for, the great Conservative party was well known. His

The whole activity of the lives of such men as John Stuart Mill, or as Paul Joseph Proudhon, is one long implicit confession that their ideal society does not yet exist; that, like the patriarchs and prophets and apostles of Jesus Christ, they "seek one to come." The question is, Does this society exist anywhere? Is it "a City which hath foundations"? Where does their idea exist? Has it any existence? Where is the splendour to be beheld upon which the inward vision of their faith was resting, upon which their outward eyesight never rested? Is it a dream? Or is there a substance of the things they hoped for, an existence of the things not seen, upon which their affections were set? Is there yet anywhere the perfect fellowship? Is there yet anywhere the perfect master, the perfect servant, the perfect son, the perfect ruler, the perfect man? Is there anywhere any certain pledge that our Humanity is moving toward its perfection, and not toward new dissolutions? Is there yet anywhere One who is working for the perfection of the universe, and of each part of it, and whose work will be completely triumphant and successful? The sceptic answers all these questions with a sad "No;" or he answers them with a half-hopeful but half uncertain "May be." Either he must tell men, "Such things exist not, such a business is nowhere

death is no loss to anybody, for he was a rank but amiable infidel, and a most dangerous person. The sooner those 'lights of thought,' who agree with him, go to the same place, the better will it be for both Church and State. We can well spare the whole crew of them, and shall hear of their departure, whether one by one or in a body, with calm satisfaction."

being done;" or else he may tell them, "These will perhaps exist hereafter, this business will perhaps some day 'be done on earth, as it is in'—our dreams." But Jesus Christ has sent His Church to tell "all nations" and "every creature" of mankind that these things do exist; that they now "are" where He is sitting as the Son of Man at the right hand of God; that they are there that they may also be here; that the will of the Father of all which is now being done in heaven is also to be so done in the earth. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God."

XVI.

PRAYER TO THE FATHER IN THE SON'S NAME.

ROGATION SUNDAY, MAY 22, 1870.

ST. JOHN xvi. 23.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, He will give it you."

I THINK every one must grant that this is the most daring promise ever yet uttered. We may try to increase its marvellous confidence and startling assurance by paraphrases of our own, but we shall find that the words of the Lord in their strong simplicity are already so startling and so bold that we can add nothing to them. The promise of Jesus Christ to all whom He addresses is the more daring because it is so clear, and it at once takes its place among those promises which can be put to the proof. Promises are often vague in proportion to their importance to the persons who are asked to depend upon them. Few men can have reached manhood without wishing that they had put less trust in ready promisers. Trust in a reckless, suave, and plausible dealer in promises has been the spring of the

failure and defeat of many a life which might have done good service to God and man. We come at last to test the worth of a man, not by the largeness but by the littleness of his promises. We suspect that the pleasant and smiling talker who says, "Whatsoever you shall ask I will give you," will never give us anything worth the asking. If we are in real need of a friend, we turn to some one who has called out our faith in him by the very fact that he does no wholesale trade in promises.

This promise of Jesus Christ has played a wonderful part in the development of modern civilisation. You could not write the history of any European nation, or indeed of any great city in Europe, without taking it into account. The most splendid and conspicuous sight in nearly every city is its cathedral church, the great building in which for generation after generation the citizens have assembled to ask the Unseen Ruler of the universe to fulfil the daring promise of Jesus of Nazareth, upon which for eighteen centuries all the prayers of Christendom have been depending. If this undertaking of Jesus Christ be a false deceit, has there not been time enough, and enough sharpness of wit and stolid practicality in so many generations of praying Christians, for the discovery of its delusiveness and its uselessness? There is certainly nothing vague in it—"*Whatsoever things* ye shall ask in My name." It is not beyond the reach of proof—"the Father *will give* them to you."* If we are

* ὅσα ἂν—δώσει.

not satisfied with the testimony of the consciousness and experience of Christendom—and in such a matter I do not say that we ought to be—you and I, my brethren, can for ourselves put this bold Promiser to the test. You and I can test whether the spirit by which Jesus made and still makes this promise is of God. You and I can test whether Jesus had and has the right to imply that the Invisible Father is in co-equal partnership with Him, and that the Creator or Manager of the world is pledged to do whatever this Son of Man says He will do. There is not a soul here who cannot try whether this is a tremendous assumption, whether it is the most dreadful and wasteful of all deceits, or whether it is the truth of truths for creatures in a lifelong condition of need. Each of us can try whether, after all, the Father *will* give us whatsoever we ask Him in the name of Jesus Christ. Trying this, we can try whether the Son of Man is the only begotten Son of God. Trying this, we can further try whether God is merely our inventor and manipulator, or whether He is not figuratively but really "*our* Father."

I.

There is certainly something very enticing to old and young, rich and poor, good and bad, to all sorts of men, about the first word of the promise—*Whatsoever*. Who is there who has not something he would like to ask? Jesus puts this most sugges-

tive word first. He does not begin, "*The Father will give you* whatsoever you shall ask;" but He begins, "*Whatsoever you shall ask* in My name, the Father will give." The gift and the giver have the same order in this promise as they probably had in the minds of the listeners, as they naturally have in the mind of every petitioner and beggar. Have they the same order, then, in the mind of the Son of God? Certainly not. "When ye pray," He says to us petitioners and beggars, "say, Our Father, Which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name." He teaches us, as our first lesson in praying, to invert this carnal selfish disorderliness which we are taking for order, and to think first of the Giver and then of His good and perfect gifts. The more we know of the Giver, the more daringly shall we ask for His gifts.

But when Jesus Christ made this promise He was educating eleven coarse and self-seeking fishermen. In that same night, at that same supper-table, they had been wrangling which of them was to get hold of the richest gifts and highest honours for Christ's name's sake from Christ's Father. It was their first thought, as it will probably be our first thought, on hearing such a promise—"What shall we ask? What shall we get?" Our tender Master, my brethren, went down to their level and comes down to ours. He meets us in the low pit of our selfishness, where we are debating, "What shall I ask from God? What do I most wish to have? Is it fortune? admiration from others? splendid success? a higher place

than my brethren?" Some disciple, as he catches the agreeable echo of the Lord's "whatsoever," may say, "I will ask for an idle life, for plenty of pleasure, for unbroken health, for sufficient money, for a good name, for the success of every project I set my heart upon. Will God give me these?"

What a miserable fall from heaven to earth! The Lord has no sooner said "Whatsoever ye shall ask," than we treat Him as if He were the tempter who said to Him, and says to His disciples, "All these things will I give Thee if Thou wilt fall down and worship me." We may have, Jesus assures us, everything we need, everything we can dare to ask in His name. Yet the first things we ask are the things which He has shown us we do not need, by saying to one "Follow Me," to another, "Sell all that thou hast," by calling all to take up His cross. "Seek ye *first*," He says, "the kingdom of God and its righteousness; and," He then promises, "all these things shall be added unto you."

Let us put ourselves into the place of those to whom Jesus gave this promise. How came Peter, Andrew, Matthew, John, and the rest to be sitting at this supper-table? How was it that these eleven men out of the millions of the human race were there to receive in person for themselves and for us this promise, on which every prayer of every human creature consciously or unconsciously depends? They had "forsaken all" and followed Him. They had given up the very things which we first think of

asking. They had sought and asked first for the kingdom of God and its righteousness, and they were leaving it to God—somewhat impatiently it may be, but still in honest and good faith—to add unto them whatsoever other things He might please. Jesus Christ had first of all taken away from His apostles, as the condition of their being His disciples, the very things which we first think of asking Him to give us. They would all have borne witness that He had given them infinitely more than He had taken away from them.

I might say that the promise of our blessed Lord considered as a whole—that is with the inclusion of the words "in My name"—sets before us the proper limit and range of our praying. But I do not like to speak of limitation in connection with such a promise of the Lord; and in truth it is we ourselves who limit that large *whatsoever* of Jesus which itself declares His promise to be illimitable. We are not making use of the promise of the Lord when we ask the Father to give us things which He will not give us because He is our Father and we are His sons and daughters, nor when we entreat God to give us something which the devil may give us, but which He cannot give us because He is God—that is, The Good. Only "every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights." We are not making proof of the promise of the Son when we ask our Father to give us things which our enemies will certainly give us if we keep their damn-

able commandments, although they cannot ensure us in our possession of them. Do we ask for money? We can get this if we will keep the commandments of the devil—"Thou shalt steal;" "Thou shalt cheat;" "Thou shalt murder." Do we pray for position? We can get this if we will keep the commandments of the world—"Push, get on, overturn every one who stands between you and your prize; turn all the men you can into stepping-stones over whose possessions and faculties you can walk forward to success." St. James, who tells us that good and perfect gifts come from the Father, also says to us, "Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts."

II.

I do not think that we can appreciate this promise, if we separate it from the character of the persons to whom it was made. The character of the apostles lay not in what they had done or had given up, but in what they had to do. It was one of the most solemn hours in the history of the world. Jesus Christ was alone with the eleven for the last time before His death. "Whatsoever *ye* shall ask," He said to the apostles, "He will give it *you*." The first pronoun indeed is not in the Greek, but the second is, and we ought not to leave it unconsidered.

(1.) The Lord must have made this promise to all the apostles as one body and fellowship. They

were with Him at His table as the first-fruits and the fathers of the catholic *Church.* "Whatsoever" the whole Church shall ask the Father in the Son's name, that He will give. On this promise the faith and hope of the Church in Universal Councils rested for so many ages. The Universal Council was in its idea a summary of Christendom, a gathering together of Christ's whole family, in which every single living Christian either in person or by representation agreed to ask the Father to give His Church in the Son's name, for some defined end, His specifically Fatherly gift, the Holy Spirit, as the leader into all truth promised by the Lord to the apostles.* But for this end the Council must be really *universal*—that is, it must include in person or by representation the whole "ye" of Christendom to whom the Head of the Church has made the promises. The bishops or other deputies sent to it must be elected by the voice of all Christ's disciples, clergy and laity. Until the Lord's congregation in its primary and narrower senses has been organically restored in the parishes, and then in the dioceses, and then in each of the nations, it will be impossible for the Lord's Congregation in its widest and most universal sense to assemble as one. If all the present bishops in Christendom—English, Roman, American, or Eastern—were to assemble together, they would not now constitute a Universal Council in the sense in which Nicæa was universal. The

* *ver.* 13.

Nicene bishops took with them to the Council the authority of the Churches which had elected them, and the Christian consciousness of the Churches which had "looked them out" as "men full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom."

(2.) The apostles, however, were not only the then totality of Christ's Church; they had been His disciples before they were apostles—they were *Christians*. To all Christians the Lord makes this promise; it belongs, as He said elsewhere, to any two or three who shall agree to ask anything in His name.

(3.) But the apostles were also *Men*. The Son of God made Himself known to them that they might make it known to all human creatures that they have a Fellow and Brother in the heavens, the Son of Man in Whose Name men may boldly speak to the Unseen God as Father. A few hours after this discourse, a dying thief, who had never been a disciple, asked Jesus to remember him when He came into His kingdom, and He promised him that even he should be that day with Him in Paradise. His fellow-criminal who made no prayer received not the promise. We may say, therefore, that almost the last words Jesus spake before death were an invitation to the lowest outcasts of Humanity unto prayer in His name.

The promise which He has bound to prayer in His name is His pledge that He is with us in the body or out of the body, that the Head has not cut Himself off from the Church, that the Man has not separated

Himself from Humanity, that the Sufferer is still at one with sufferers. The promise was not uttered, you will recollect, as a thing by itself. It was a part of a long discourse by which He was preparing His Church for the withdrawal of His visible presence—first, for three days by His death and burial; next, for the whole period of world-history until the end of the ages by His ascension into the heavens. He left men two great means of laying hold of their communion with Him—Prayer, by which men ascend up to Him; the Eucharist, instituted on this night, by which He comes down to men.

At the same table at which the Lord instituted the Eucharist, He solemnly instituted Christian prayer. "You and others," He seems to say to His apostles, "have been used to come to Me for these three years for everything you have wanted in body, soul, and spirit—for knowledge, for eyesight, for hearing, for health, for food, for salvation from evil. Do not think any of the things I have given you or can give you will be wanting to you because you no longer see Me, hear Me, touch Me. The Father has given you whatsoever things you have asked from Me, and have had through Me, these three years. When I have gone up to My Father He will still do what He has been doing. Whatsoever things ye shall ask Him in My name, He will give you."

III.

"The Father," our Lord declares to His apostles, "will give you whatsoever things ye shall *ask*." Every father gives his children a great number of gifts they never ask for, and perhaps these unasked gifts are the best he gives them. It was not the asking of Humanity which brought down from the Father His greatest gift to men, His Only-Begotten; or it was only a dumb and inarticulate kind of asking, such a prayer as the arid land and withering herbs in the parching heat of summer send up to their Creator for the gift of rain. God is not like those surly fathers who say to their praying children, "If you ask, you shall not have;" "Wait until you are asked." Such parents are stiflers of prayer. Prayer is good for the children. It is a necessary expression of the relation of the children to the father. A father who looks on asking simply as bothering will make his children look upon the way of access to him as hard and unpleasant, and they will trouble him as little as they can with their prayers. A true father has indeed often to repel or reject the prayers of his children, because they, like himself as a son of God, know not what to pray for as they ought. But he rejects their prayer without repelling their praying. He lets them see that they "ask and have not," because they "ask amiss." He takes care that his refusal to satisfy their lusts shall not discourage them in their access to him. It is so with *the* Father. He is our

Educator, and He is teaching us to pray. Prayer is as much a matter of growth as any other habit. By prayer—by prayers unanswered or repelled as much as by answered prayers—every child learns to know both his father and himself. To ask as a child implies dependence, faith, the sacrifice of self-will, and the cross. The unfilial nature in every little child says, "I shall go here and there, I shall do this or that." But the childlike nature in every little child—the sign of his creation after the likeness of *the* Son—on the contrary *asks*, "May I go here or there? Shew me where to go. May I do this? Give me that, if it be your will." The new man in Humanity, which is the communication of the Son of Man Who is the Interceder, is an *asking* man, although it is not a greedy and a having man.

IV.

It is by the next word in His promise that the High Priest of our needy race brings us to the full meaning and very heart of prayer. God will give us those things which we really ask of Him as God: "Whatsoever thing ye ask *the Father*." Prayer may mean in our vocabulary the asking for whatsoever we lust after. If this be prayer, of course it matters little to whom we pray, so long as the person prayed to can give us what we covet. It will pay us best, if this be our meaning of prayer, to make our court to the world, or to worship

the devil. Neither the world nor the devil love us; they have never made a sacrifice for us as the sign and pledge of their relation to us; they demand sacrifices from us. It is because they do not love us that they will not refuse, if they have the power, to gratify our lusts. To give us our lusts is the way to get us as their slaves.

But if prayer be, as the Intercessor of our race always teaches, nothing but the going of the children to the Father to ask of Him what they need, it is an action of faith and of self-sacrifice. "Our Father" must be the beginning of it. "Thy will be done" must be its centre. You who are parents, and have a wise love for your children, may learn more about prayer from the different petitions they put up to you and your different ways of answering them, than you can learn from a thousand treatises. Through your relation to each other as parent and children, giver and receivers, withholder and non-receivers, *the* Father is teaching you your relation to Him as children, as offerers of prayer, as obtainers or losers of the things you ask. In the divine relationship of the members of a family to one another we have the standing parable of prayer, as the Elder Brother of the whole family in heaven and earth has taught us. You think it hard that your children should have no faith in you, that they should not freely and boldly pray to you for what they want. You expect that the same faith which so trusts you as to ask good gifts from you will, in time, under

your education, shew itself to be the faith of children by their surrender of their desire for those things which your fatherly wisdom thinks it wrong to give them. You use your children's prayers to you as the instrument of their education as spirits. First, you call out and increase their *faith* in you as father by encouraging them to come to you, trustfully, boldly, and believingly with all their wants; to "ask" (as St. James says you also should ask) "in faith, nothing wavering." You teach them that the greatest dishonour they can do you is to distrust you, that the truest worship they can pay you is to put faith in you. You train them to hallow your fatherly name, the name they bear. Secondly, you do not give them everything they ask. You teach them to submit to the laws of your fatherly kingdom, to surrender their wills to your fatherly will. You give them their daily bread. You forgive them their trespasses, and teach them to forgive one another. You guide them in temptation. You deliver them from evil. In proportion as you are what all the world acknowledges to be a good and true father to your children, God your Father is educating you to learn out of your own acts what He is to you who pray. In the acts of the most wilful of your children, He is shewing you what you are to Him who hears your prayers. "What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto

your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good gifts to them that ask Him?" If this is the providence of men like you, who have in you but some little derived seed of charity, and give but fickle culture and nurture to that you have, what must be the providence of that Father Who with the Son and with the Holy Ghost is the substantial and underived Charity?

V.

We come at last to that which is the most important clause in the promise of the Lord. We shall have, He assures us, whatsoever we ask *in His name.* "Nothing that you need," He seems to say, "will be wanting because I go away from you. Whatsoever is wanting, it will be counting solely because you do not or cannot ask for it in My name."

The Father does indeed, as the loving Educator of mankind, give us some things which we do not ask in His Son's name. "Thou saidst, Give me a king and princes? I gave thee a king in mine anger, and took him away in my wrath." Sometimes the only way to save the soul of the wilful child is to let his soul have for a time what it wills and lusts for, that he may learn, like the prodigal, by the fruits of wilfulness the misery of wilfulness.

Many men and women who have not heard the name of Jesus have asked God for good and perfect gifts in prayer, and they have had from the Father

what they asked. David is witness. Cornelius is witness. Thousands of Jews, Pagans, Buddhists, Mohammedans, Theists, are witnesses. But if the Son uncovers here the mystery of prayer, the law of praying, and the hidden history of every prayer, then they all must have prayed to the Father in His Son's name, although their understanding did not perceive it, although their lips could not utter the syllables of it. They honoured God by treating Him as God—as the Good, as Love, as caring for the true health and wealth of all His creatures. They put faith in God as their Father by humbly submitting to do without whatever gifts were denied them by that Will to which they owed their being and their culture as human creatures. They believed the Father and believed in Him, although they did not know the name of the Son,—the Name which is the cause, the proof, and the pledge to men that they are the children of God. "Doubtless Thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us;"—this was and is the faith, so full of honour to God, in which myriads of His children in all lands have cried and do cry to Him. The sending of His Son and His Spirit were God's assertions that their faith in Him was and is true. The Ascension and Pentecost were not only God's calls to men to put faith in Him as the Father; but they were also God's justification of the least measure of faith which men had ever placed in Him as their Father before His Son was revealed: they justify the filial faith which men who know not His Son's name yet place in Him. How can we

doubt that all the prayers and noble desires now addressed to The Good and The Righteous by those who do not know the revelation of His Son and the sending of His Spirit find their way to God through the One Who has not merely included but includes Humanity in Himself? Are not all such askers breathing out the filial Spirit which He has first breathed into His creatures?

Our blessed Lord, however, made this promise to disciples who had already confessed His name. To ask in Christ's name is, as Grotius says, the universal *mos ecclesiæ*, the custom of the Church in praying. After the tradition of the holy apostles, who received this promise for themselves and for all who through them should believe in His name, the Church ends every prayer by placing it in the hands of the Son of God, the Mediator and Advocate. This closing of her prayers is her act of faith in the Son. By it she intrusts Him with all her petitions, that He Who is One with the Father may cast out of them whatever is unfit for children to ask the Father, that she may receive whatever in all her petitions she really asks in His name. To ask in His name is to ask that we may have whatever the Son of God can ask: it is to ask that we may not have what the Son of God cannot ask.

The mere tacking of the clause "through Jesus Christ our Lord" to the end of a piece of selfish mendicancy does not change a greedy cry for the satisfaction of our coveteousness into a prayer

in Christ's name. If many who have never heard the syllables of His name have nevertheless prayed in His name, so many who utter those syllables at the end of every prayer do not pray in His name. Men have before now entreated God to give them revenge upon their enemies through Jesus Christ their Lord. But they did not really ask this in His name, because it is the name of the reconciler of mankind, Who will not be their divider. Men have asked God to help them to great fortune for the sake of Jesus Christ their Lord. But no man ever yet really asked this in His name, because He has made (as He taught each of us at our baptism) renunciation the first condition of bearing His name. No self-seeking prayer can possibly be asked in His name. His name is the basis of our unity. Prayer in His name is a common, united, family prayer; it may be spoken by one child, but it is spoken to His and *our* Father. "Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them by My Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them."

These days before the Ascension of our Intercessor have long been days of praying, the Church's Rogation-tide. Hence the Church has chosen for these this Gospel in which He promises that she shall have whatsoever she shall ask in His name. A time of rogation, you will perhaps see, could not come

at more fit time than this, when we are about to celebrate not only the great fact of our Intercessor's ascension into the heavens, there to appear in the presence of God for us men, but also the greater fact of the descent to us from heaven of the all-giving Spirit of the Father and the Son. I do not think, indeed, that we can expect Ascension Day to take that hold upon the intellect and conscience of mankind which Easter and Whitsun Day have taken. Ascension Day must be regarded as belonging to one or other of these. The Resurrection of the Head of our kind effected, His Ascension is thereby predicted and expected; and His Ascension effected, some Pentecost upon the members He has left on earth must be looked forward to by all who believe that Man is with God. Prayer in His name is our present following upward of Jesus Christ: it is the believing ascension of our hearts into the heavens. Every instant of prayer in His name is an Ascension-tide. Every answer to prayer is a Whitsun-tide. Every interval between asking and receiving ought to be an Expectation-tide—a season of patient and expectant waiting for the promise which cannot fail, like those ten days in which the first disciples honoured and worshipped the Father by their filial faith and hope.

Rogation-tide is a confession of our faith that the union between the Lord and the disciples, the Head and the Church, the Man and Humanity, the earth and heaven, has never been broken. What kind of gifts are

those which, century after century, year after year, the Church has invited men to ask from the Father as fit rogations? What sort of gifts do we ask at this season in the name of the Son? Universal gifts, the general good, common things, things fit to be asked by you, as "the children of your Father Which is in heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." A rogation is a common litany. Our own litany, in its first form, was a prayer for the Rogation-tide processions. The rogations were intended to ask the Father for such things as the warding off of sicknesses, plagues, famines, wars, and destructive storms from nations and cities; to ask Him to temper the air, to make the land fruitful, to give peaceable times, that His people might serve Him in godly quietness and honesty. The miracles of the Son of God are His signs to us that these are things which we can ask in His name.

XVII.

THE FELLOWSHIP IN GOD THE SOURCE OF HUMANITY'S FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD.

TRINITY SUNDAY, MAY 23, 1869.

EPHESIANS ii. 18.

"For through Him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father."

ST. AUGUSTINE says to the ever-blessed Trinity in his Confessions, "O God, Thou hast made us for Thyself, and restless are our hearts until they find their rest in Thee." It is this inquietude of the heart which sets the intellect restlessly searching for God. Some of you must have heard of the famous search of Hieron of Syracuse. The scholarly ruler longed to know something of the nature and character of that Power which reigns over kings. Finding no satisfaction in his own guesses, his own inductions, in any of the images of a deity his own intellect or conscience or heart could make, he sought for some access to God, Cicero tells us in his book on "The Nature of the Gods," through the profounder intellect of the poet Simonides. Every time the king questioned him, the philosophical poet asked to be granted a longer time for the preparation of his

answer. He also found no access to God; or, if there were any accesses, he found them all dark and barred to him. No Word cast light upon them; no Spirit led him through them. At last he had to declare to the tyrant, "The longer I consider God, the more obscure and indiscoverable He seems to me to be!"* Their conclusion would be—the reverse of the apostle's message—"We men have no access to God."

In the first Lesson at Matins we heard the ever-blessed Trinity in Unity saying, "Let Us make man in Our image." Hieron and Simonides were men: the creaturely image of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, therefore, lay buried in the ruler Hieron and the poet Simonides. This image of Himself in His human creatures could not be raised up from its tomb in fulness of life until the Father had sent the Son into human flesh to reveal God, and had by the ascended Son poured out upon human flesh His Holy Spirit. The search of Hieron and Simonides after God was the half-dumb cry of the human soul for a revealer of the hidden God—for God's own Word; it was a prayer for God's own Son to come and tell men that God is their Father. It was the yearning for a Divine Leader into all truth—for God's own Spirit; it was a cry for God's own Spirit to descend into them and enable them to cry, "Abba, Father!" God alone can of course know God. If any creatures are to know Him they must have

* "Inquit, diutius considero, tanto mihi res videtur obscurior."—*De Naturâ Deorum*, I. xiii.

something of God in themselves. "The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." The Spirit of God within men must recognize the God in Whom they live and move and have their being.

I.

Let us now turn from the confession of the two wise pagans to the bold profession of the writer of the text. "We," says St. Paul, "have access by one Spirit unto the Father." Either we are told in the text the most impudent and daring of all assumptions, or else we hear in it what the human conscience must recognize as a gospel—the very glad dest news to men about God. A Jewish tentmaker, who travelled up and down the Roman empire, alternately working privately at his trade and publicly asserting as a teacher the most extraordinary declarations about God, assured the Jews and the low class of Greek race* who had joined the new society of which he was one of the leaders, that he and they actually *possessed* that which the powerful ruler and the thoughtful poet of Greek race sought for and could not find. "*We* have access." The Jews and the Greeks who had undergone the common rite of immersion in water, which made them members of the society Paul called "the Church," did not indeed agree so smoothly as the refined prince and philosophic poet. There was between the Christians

* The words "in Ephesus" (i. 1) are wanting in the oldest MSS.

in Ephesus far less unanimity—less of what our carnal man takes for unity—than between the philosophical ruler and his court of poets and scholars. These Christians were always wrangling and disagreeing about the very doctrine they professed to hold in common. And yet Paul of Tarsus dared to say of himself and of the curious and despicable Jewish and Greek following which he had in Ephesus and elsewhere, "We *both* have access unto God."

That God has by His very being access to men, the most profound and pious of the heathen in the first century had already come to believe. But see how much more bold the apostle is than the philosophers dared to be; for he says that we men have access to God.* God is not only accessible to men, but the way of access to Him is laid down toward Him for men. The door is opened through which if men will enter, they can find God and know Him. "A door," the apostle and evangelist St. John says in to-day's Epistle, "was opened in heaven," and through that door he beheld the adoration of the Trinity in Unity.

II.

The "we" of the universal apostle cannot be confined to the Church; it must include all whom Christ desires to come into the Church. "All nations" have the access to God; "every creature" has it. There is One Who is saying always and to

* ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγήν.

all, "I am the door: by Me if *any man* enter in he shall be saved."

St. Paul declares that He is the one door of access to God, that He is the way by which men can reach God, that He is the Mediator through whom the hidden God shews and exposes Himself to us. "*Through Him* we have the access." Jesus Christ not only said, "I am the door," but He also said, "I am the way:" "no man cometh unto the Father but by Me." If Hieron and Simonides had known Jesus Christ—the Man who was born a feeble babe, Who lived and taught and worked wonders of charity for a few years in Palestine, Who was put to death as a blasphemer of God on the Roman gallows, Whom death could not hold captive—they would have known God. Since it is possible for every man to know Jesus, it is possible for men to know God.

But some men may say, "What we ask is to see God; and here you shew us a man." It is true, indeed, that if Jesus Christ be only a man, it is the vilest of all deceits to say that He reveals and exposes God. From a godlike man we may guess and gather something about God, since more of the Divine thought is expressed in a good man than is expressed in a tree or an animal, or in the lightning or in a star, or in anything else. It is not the Divine thought, however, that man yearns to know, but the hidden Divine Thinker; if we know Him, we shall know His thoughts towards ourselves. Not only can we make no perfect

image of God, but even God Himself has made none. The Catholic faith says that there is a perfect image of the hidden God, and He is "not made," but eternally "begotten." God Himself we can, of course, only see in God. The Church says that Jesus Christ is not only godlike, but that He is God; that He is not a Son of God, but the Son. If this be true, the Man Christ Jesus is the access of men to God; for He is nothing less than God made Man—God self-humanized before men, not a man self-deified into a God. He made this claim for Himself: "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father"—that Father Whom, in Himself, no man hath seen or can see. "Believe Me that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me." His assertion of His very Godhead was made the final proof of His very manhood. For He was put to death, He underwent the natural end of man, because He asserted that He was *the* Son of the Highest.

It is His manhood which constitutes Jesus the door and way to God for us men. Hence the apostle does not say—like some weak preacher afraid to state "the gospel" lest he should tell men too "good news" about God—through Him we *can* have access. He says boldly, We *have* it. Yes, "we," for this Person of the Undivided Triune Godhead, through Whom we can approach and know the Godhead, is already and completely our own. He Who is "our God" is ours because He is Man. We have not to persuade Him to be humane,

for He is human. So far is the Church from hiding His real Manhood, that it is all her hope for herself and for mankind—all her joy, all her glory, all her strength. She has come to use as her universal symbol the instrument of His death — the Cross by which God the Son finally bore witness that He was a very and true Man, that He belonged entirely to our kind, by dying as men die.

The Human Person through Whom we have access to God is, the Faith declares, God the Son. There is no certainty that God is the Father, unless it be true that He has, and ever has had, a co-eternal Son. We might, by a figure of speech, call Him *a* Father; but *the* eternal and absolute Father He cannot be, unless there is One Who is not merely *a* Son, but is the eternal absolute Son. For if we can suppose there was a time in which God had no Son, we suppose a time in which He was not really the Father, although He might choose to become a Father in some future. St. Hilary boldly said, "We could not preach one God to men, if we had to preach a lonely God." God is not merely *One*, not a mere unit, but He is the one *God;* that is, according to the force of our English word, The One who is The Good, the One Who includes in His perfect unity all possible good. That negative unity of God, upon which the Jew, the Mahometan, and the Unitarian ground their reason for not receiving the catholic and human faith, does not include all good; for it excludes what is the chief good, so far

as we can see, of every spirit—fellowship, society, communion. The Divine Unity, into Whose Name the Son through Whom we have access to that Unity commands His Church to baptize "all nations" and "every creature," *is* a Divine Unity; that is, is not a Divine solitariness, a Divine egotism. From a solitary God, an egotistic God, all that is best, and therefore godliest, in the human heart necessarily shrinks; for there is no likeness of such a God in ourselves. When we become egotistic, and attempt to be self-sufficing solitaries, we become less godly. We ourselves deteriorate by the absence of fellowship, and we lose the power of drawing to us the faith and love and worship of others. God's revelation of Himself to His human creatures as the Trinity in Unity—as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one God—has drawn forth from men of all ages and places, all degrees of culture and of ignorance, the most wonderful joy, hope, faith, and love. A man is at his highest, he is most perfectly a man, he is most godly, when he is living, not as a mere unit, but as the fellow of a unity—as a kinsman in the Family, as a citizen in the State, as a catholic in the Church, as a man in the Humankind. He is at his very lowest when he is striving to shrivel himself into a unit, to become independent of all fellows, to close the "access" of men to himself, to take nothing from Humanity, and to add nothing to it, but to enfold himself in himself. Is it not a solace and joy to human

hearts to hear the one Undivided God say in making our race, "Let *Us* make man in *Our* image"? It assures us that He who made us, and Who can do what He will with us, is not a cold, hard, lonely, self-amusing Mechanician, caring little what becomes of His experiments. It assures us that in His Being subsists the perfect Fellowship, the perfect Unity, the perfect Communion of which we have some imperfect shadow in our being, and for whose full reproduction in us and our kind we crave with so insatiable a hunger. In the Perfection out of which our Humanity started in its germ exists the pledge of the perfection towards which it is moving as its end.

III.

Through Jesus Christ, the apostle says, the Jew and Gentile in Ephesus and everywhere could find a common access to God. If a man does arrive at that awful goal which Hieron and Simonides sought in vain to reach, *what* will he find God to be? Through Jesus Christ, St. Paul tells us, "we have access *to the Father*." The sight of the Father which is attained through the Son shews men, whether they be Jews or Ephesians or Englishmen, what they themselves are in the same Son. God sent forth His Son, St. Paul told the Galatians, that they might receive the adoption of sons; and because they were sons, God sent-forth the Spirit of His Son into their hearts, crying, Abba, Father.

The access of men to God is here described by the apostle as access to the Father. For the apostle elsewhere calls Him "the Father of Whom are all things." The ancient Catholic fathers, while contending for the human race against the heresies which separated God and Humanity, always strongly asserted the priority of the Father. St. Thomas Aquinas, a witness to the general consciousness of the Church in the Middle Ages, says that St. Paul "calls our access to the whole most holy Trinity specially access to the Father, that he may shew that whatever the Son and the Spirit have or give, they have and give from the Father. He is the Fount of the Godhead human sins have offended: on that account sinners are specially said to be reconciled to Him, as to the whole Godhead in its fountain and source." Our blessed Lord Himself said, "The Father *hath* life in Himself," but "*hath given* to the Son to have life in Himself." The great doctors (as Bishop Pearson says in his exposition of the first article of the Creed) "have not stuck to call the Father the Origin, the Cause, the Author, the Root, and the Head of the Son." The Father is the one person of the Trinity in Unity who is Himself "made of none; neither created, nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone; not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding." These are not dead terms of doctrine; the Church sings them this day

in her hymn as facts for world-wide human rejoicing.

Certainly "the Father" is the God men ask for, the God they need. If, in finding access to God, we could find only an Almighty, a Creator, a Supreme Being, it is not certain that we should be any the better; it is certain that we should be none the more glad. In such a God the old man in us seems already to believe: the more we think about Him, apart from the Son in whom He is "*our* God," the less we shall care to retain Him in our thoughts, or we shall serve Him with mechanical drudgery. We do not really *know God* until we know Him as "our" Father, until we realize that we are indeed through Jesus Christ "the children of God." Some may ask, Do Mahommetans and Arians never look up to God with the faith of children? St. John declares that the Only begotten Son of God is the true light who enlightens "every man who comes into the world"; St. Peter says that the Spirit Who cries "Abba, Father," in men, has been poured out on "all flesh." No man, therefore, can number those out of all kindreds and nations and languages who believe with their hearts in the Trinity in Unity, although they never formulate this faith by their understanding. It was the work of the apostles and it is the work of the Church to publish the gospel which says to all such, "Whom ye ignorantly worship, we declare unto you" as our Father and your Father.

IV.

The apostle does not only teach us that there is, in the person of the Son, a door and a pathway by which we men have access to the invisible God; but he further assures us that there is a guide and leader given to our spirits, in the person of the Holy Spirit. He leads men to that door: He guides men along that way: "For through Him we both have access *by one Spirit.*" The Holy Ghost does not "speak of Himself:" "He," said Jesus, "shall glorify Me." He takes of thethings of Jesus Christ and shews them unto us. In Jesus Christ the Trinity in Unity is knowable. Yet men may see Jesus—as the Pharisees and Sadducees saw Him—without knowing God. Jesus taught those who knew Him best, that He could not be perfectly known, nor God known through Him, unless that Spirit Who is One with the Father and Himself was given to men and obeyed by them. In Jesus the hidden God is revealed to men, and is knowable by men; but each man's actual knowledge of God is the work of the Holy Ghost upon the man himself. We do not know God the Holy Ghost unless He leads us to the Son, and shews us the Son as He is: we do not know the Son unless we pass through Him to "the Father who sent" Him, and is shewing Himself to us in Jesus. The Holy Spirit thus turns the thoughts of those whom He leads and guides from Himself to Jesus the Son; and the Son lifts up the minds and hearts of those who come to Him from Himself to the

Father. This is not a mere statement of theories, but it is the experience of the personal and historical consciousness of Christendom.

The access we have to the Trinity in Unity by the Holy Ghost is not an access of comprehension, but of knowledge. God as God "is dwelling," St. Paul said to the bishop of Ephesus, "in the light which no man can approach unto." Yet the same apostle says here to these Asiatic Churches, that through the Son as our door, by the Spirit as our leader, we men have an approach to God. The catholic faith assures us that we have that best of all knowledge, that closest and dearest of all approaches—that which *a child* has because it is a son or daughter. The knowledge which the Holy Ghost gives men through the Son is knowledge of the Father. A child certainly does not comprehend his father. But he knows his father with a kind and degree of knowledge which the equals of his father (who may perhaps be said to comprehend him) do not possess. He has an "access" to his father which he could not gain if he were not his child. Look at some ordinary father. Perhaps a hundred persons can more or less clearly and accurately weigh and measure and ticket that man. Yet the wisest of them all does not *know* him as that little ignorant child knows him who sits upon the man's knee, and has received from God filial right and spiritual power to say to that man, "Abba, father." The child knows his father

because he has first received this sonship, and then like a son loves him, trusts him, and rejoices in him. The fruits which the Holy Spirit of power develops in men as children of The Father through The Son are, St. Paul declares, such as these—love, joy, faith, and many more, the graces of children. Thus the rudest man or woman, who cannot reason about the Trinity, may *know* the Trinity more perfectly than some acute theologian who has by heart all the writings of St. Athanasius or St. Augustine, and all the controversies of the first six centuries.

The apostle, however, does not merely say that men have access to God by the Spirit; he says it is by the "*one* Spirit." As there is One only who is *the* Father, One only who is *the* Son, so One only is *the* Spirit. Because the Spirit which God has given to all humanity through its new Head, Jesus Christ, is One, unity of spirit is given again in Him to our naturally divided and self-sundering race. The "one Spirit" became, from the instant of His outpouring, the factor of the "one body." In ourselves and in Adam, we are God's enemies; in Jesus Christ we are His sons; and "because we are sons," the apostle says, "God has sent forth (the one Spirit) the Spirit of His Son into our hearts crying, Abba, Father." The organized Unity of those who confess the Fatherhood of God, the Catholic Church, becomes God's witness to Humanity that He is the Father also of all those who have not yet come home to Him, as well as of those who have.

Since the Holy Spirit is the "one *Spirit*," that which He gives to the most diverse men is an inward and spiritual gift. It is one common heart and common mind. It is that "mind of Christ" in whom alone our race is one. "By the Spirit," St. Paul says to the two parties then dividing the Catholic Church, the Jew and the Gentile, "*we both* have access unto the Father." The Jews, he has just said, were nigh to God; the Nations were far off from Him; but now Christ has "made them both one." They may think they are two sects. Outsiders may tell them they are irreconcilable. They may break away from one another; but still, since they both have access to the Father through the Son, they are really one body in Him. It is by the one Spirit that each creature and Nation has been led to Jesus. It is by the one Spirit that each is crying to God, "Abba, Father."

By various and contrary ways men have tried and are trying and will try to find access to the mystery of God, to the knowledge of God. There is one only "way"—Jesus Christ the Man: and He is the way for all men; He belongs to all. The only way to the perfect knowledge of the Trinity in Unity is to be ruled by that filial spirit which God has given to men in Jesus Christ.* He helps our infirmities; He destroys that natural imbecility and carnal fear which make us dread to come into contact with the

* "Varia fuerunt media apud Judæos quibus ad Deum accederent. Nunc unicum est omnibus. Nempe, regi Christi Spiritu." (*Calvin* in loc. 585.)

great God, lest we should find that He is not manifesting Himself in a Son, lest we should find that that He is not a Father. He gives us feeble creatures the boldness to dare to say to the otherwise unknown God, "*Our* Father."

The apostle of the Nations saw no other Unity for the Nations, knew of no other Unity of the Church, than that which was given—which still remains, into which each can enter—by the pouring out of the One Spirit upon all flesh. The work laid upon him by the Son of God was this, "Go, teach all Nations; baptizing them into the One Name—into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." For this work he was completely qualified, and the Nations inwardly prepared, by the same Spirit. The persons of the Trinity, the Catholic Faith says, are no more divided in operation than in substance; therefore it is that Origen pregnantly says, "Every rational creature, without any distinction, receives something of the Holy Ghost in the same way as of the Word or Son of God."*

If we enter ever so little way into the contemplation of the depths of the Catholic Faith—that is the faith for all mankind and every creature—we shall find it impossible to separate the unity of the Church from the unity of Humanity; we shall find it as impossible to separate the unity of Humanity from the Unity of God in the Trinity. If we do not see that man's unity is in God, and that we can

* De Principiis, vii.

each enter into it in Him, we shall seek it as the first violators of the unity of mankind are said to have sought it in some tower of Babel—some colossal manufacture of human hands and brains. In a coarse age of the world, this unity may be sought in a tower of brick and stone. In a more refined age it may be sought in a tower of laws, canons, constitutions, opinions, or even of compromises. Some may think to find it in a universal Cæsar; others may expect in a universal pontiff. The "One Spirit" is the eternal foe of all these false One unities which prevent men from entering together into the true unity which is already their own in the One Father to Whom they have access through the One Son by the One Spirit. He cast down the Tower of Babel; He separated mankind into Nations; He was the source of the free national mind which shewed itself in the tribes enslaved to Pharaoh; He called forth from the hidden reserve of mankind the new nations which overthrew the throne of Cæsar. He, as the educator of Nations in liberty and righteousness, as truly in Europe now as in Asia in old time, inspires them to declare that they must break up that kind of "catholic unity" which has no firmer centre than the bishop of Rome.*

If it were the true unity it could not be destroyed. Men cannot destroy God the Trinity in Unity. If it

* "Establishment of Religious Liberty.—Catholic Unity, after an existence of nearly 1000 years, and preserved at the cost of so many sacrifices (to God or to the devil?) has been legally destroyed in Spain!" (*Tablet*, Madrid Corr., May 10, 1869.)

has to be destroyed, it is because it keeps men from knowing their real Unity: the end of its destruction, after long trouble, must be some clearer revelation of the True Unity in the Father, through the Son, by the Holy Ghost. But that unity to which men have "access" by submission to the Pope has taught them to disbelieve that Jew and Gentile, catholic and protestant, christian and man, are one in Christ. It has its bond in the denial that there is "one Spirit" in the one baptized body, and "upon all flesh." It blasphemes the works of the liberating and humanizing Spirit in modern ages: it attributes to the devil the works of the uniting Spirit of the Father and the Son.

This great day, which was at first only the Octave of Pentecost, has now become, throughout the West, the feast of the Trinity. This is the latest of catholic feasts. This, and not *Corpus Christi* (as some amongst us dream), ought to be the latest. Beyond God, what can there be to know? It is the completion of the order of festivals; for the Holy Spirit has led the Church, ritually and liturgically, through the Son to the Father. It is the greatest of the great days of ordination in the Western Churches. On this day the Son ordains men with His Spirit, and sends them into the Nations to declare to them the Name of God, and to bring all men to confess the Name of God, and enter into the Unity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. It is the first duty of the catholic preacher on this day, not to shirk the setting forth of the

Trinity in Unity by substituting vague generalities about the existence of mysteries. When St. Paul speaks of a mystery, he means that to which we men now "have access," not that which is barred against all human access. This is the "Catholic Faith"; and we are no teachers of that faith, however loudly we protest that we are "catholics," unless this is the beginning and centre and end of our doctrine. All else which we teach must demand this as its completion. If men are made in the image of the Trinity, nothing less than knowledge of the Trinity can give them that rest which (as St. Augustine declared at the end of his wonderful experience) can only be found in God. "Thou, O God, hast made us for Thyself, and unquiet are our hearts until they rest in Thee."

XVIII.

PROPERTY AND RESPECTABILITY: OR THE IDOLS WHICH ENGLISHMEN ARE TEMPTED TO WORSHIP INSTEAD OF THE TRINITY IN UNITY.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY. JUNE 2ND, 1872.

1 ST. JOHN V. 21.

"Little children, keep yourselves from idols."

LAST Sunday we were called to contemplate and adore the name of God as the completion and crown of the Church's doctrine. From this first Sunday after Trinity until the appearance of Advent Sunday upon the Church horizon, we turn from theology to morality. But in doing so, care is taken by the Church that our morality as Christians shall be Christian, that it shall be theological. The conduct of our lives must have its starting-point from our belief in a Father of all in Heaven; it must have its end in this world in all men and women and children who have become our brothers and sisters in that Son Who has taken our universal flesh and blood upon Himself; it must seek its power from the Spirit of the Father and of the Son Who has been poured out upon all flesh. In the Epistle for the first day and

first week of this long Trinity season, that apostle who is the great witness to the inseparable union of theology and morality, St. John, gives to the blessed Trinity in Unity a moral name. "God" he says "is Love." There has been much debate whether "love" is a better rendering than "charity," the word with which the vulgate has interpreted ἀγάπη, and with which our own translators interpret it in St. Paul's famous picture of the perfect love. All good words get abused in the using of them, but the word charity has not yet been so atrociously abused as the word love. "God is Charity."

The same apostle who tells us what "God is," urges us in the text to keep ourselves from idols. I cannot pause now to dwell on the significant position which these words hold in the Bible. I shall just remind you that they are the closing words of the last epistle written by the last apostle to the whole Church (the second and third epistles of St. John were addressed to private persons), and that they summarize almost at the end of the Bible the negative side of the whole purpose of the Bible. The Bible is the record of the appearance of the Eternal Uncreated Charity amongst men to make Himself known to them, and to deliver them from the idols which they are worshipping instead of Him. From the worship of idols, as the Bible shews us throughout its course, flow forth all the sin and bondage by which mankind is cursed. The worship of idols necessitates all those miseries with which God,

because He is Charity, obliges Himself to discipline His human children.

Growth in true morality is the object which will be set before the Church in the Epistles and Gospels of the coming half-year. We take a first step toward a true morality when we flee from idolatry. When Almighty God gave Israel the moral law, it was a necessary fact of moral order that its first commandment should be, "Thou shalt have no other gods but Me." We cannot separate the two tables. If we substitute any idol or idols for the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, we not only break the first four commandments, but we open the way to the violation of all those six which have their end in our neighbour's good. St. Paul gives us a hint of this when he ties together the first commandment and the last commandment of the Decalogue in his keen conclusion—"Covetousness, which is idolatry."

I.

"Little children," says St. John, "keep yourselves from idols." He speaks as a father of the Church in Christ Jesus. He speaks to the Church, for he would not have called any pagans or any Jews his children, unless he had begotten them again to God by the gospel.* The idols, therefore, from which he entreats us to keep ourselves are the idols of Christians; not

* τεκνία. See the Lord's τέκνον, p. 399.

Baal, Moloch, Jupiter, or Woden, but such idols as baptized men and women are likely to substitute for the Eternal Charity, such idols as you and I worship and serve instead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

It would be interesting to discover what were the chief idols of St. John's contemporaries; but it would not be immediately practical. I stand here to apply his counsel to a congregation of English Christians, mainly of the middle class of English society. What, then, are those idols of the English middle class which dare to compete with the Eternal Charity for the possession of our worship and service? You think for a moment, and perhaps a shoal of hideous and amorphous images thrust themselves up before your imagination. Perhaps you think you see the idols which your neighbours worship. There may be many idols in the land which neither you nor I see. You and I may be worshipping we "know not what."* But I believe that you will soon see two idols of gigantic proportion and great power. What names shall I give them? What do you think of *Property* and *Respectability?* Are not these the two idols which at this moment, under some name or form, are receiving the intense adoration of the majority of the English middle classes?

Some one may ask, Are not property and respectability good things, and gifts of God? Undoubtedly they are. The whole Old Testament bears witness to

* St. John iv. 22.

their worth and to their source. The Lord of all revealed Himself in Egypt as the demander of human respectability for grovelling slaves, as the giver of property to men who had been robbed even of their very selves. Would to God—the God Who enriched Abraham and gave back lands to bankrupt and decayed families in His Sabbatical year, Who demanded a place in the land and a citizen's culture for every Hebrew—that every one in England had property, and that every one in England was respectable. It would realize in some measure that ideal condition of a nation which the Spirit of goodness and of liberty sets before the imagination of national prophets and economists.

But why should we think that our idols are evil in themselves? A fond mother confesses that her child is her idol, and she knows that in doing so she confesses that she is a sinner, an idolater. But she will never assert that her idolized child is himself an evil: God bears witness to her and in her that he is His own good and noble gift. I have chosen for our idols the most honourable names they ever claim. I might call one "mammon," and the other "fashion;" I might call one "the flesh," and the other "the world." But property is good and respectability is good; nevertheless they may become our idols.

The Gospel for this week supplies us with an illustration of a worshipper of both these idols. "There was a certain rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day."

II.

There can be no doubt that "Dives" was a worshipper of the first of these two false gods. Property (or as it is called by our blessed Lord, mammon) was the idol of this rich man. Property is that which is properly a man's own, that which is proper to him. In a strictly evangelical sense there is therefore no such thing as property. I do not mean because the evangelical counsel required such a man as Dives to sell all that he had and to give to Lazaruses—like St. Matthew the apostle, St. Barnabas, St. Francis of Assisi, and the Graf von Zinzendorf; for such a requisition may be local, temporal, personal. Jesus once called one young man to sell all that he had. But as Lord of all places, all ages, and all consciences, He calls some men to keep property for His use, and calls others to give it up for His sake. I mean because in all the parables of the gospel the Son sets His Father before us as the one and only real proprietor. Every man on earth, according to the Man, is nothing but a steward. What he calls his property is nothing more than the amount of the universal Father's property which He has intrusted to this steward for the good of the universal family. This is all that the French thinker substantially meant when he wrote his famous saying, "Property is theft." The surest way of keeping ourselves from the worship of property as an idol, is to regard it as belonging altogether to Him Who is the

common Father of all who have and of all who have not.

That property is as much an idol under whatever new names it may bear in England, as it was under the old name mammon which it bore in Jewry, is evident from the intensely *religious* tone in which Englishmen always speak of it. What is usually the final argument, and the prevailing argument, against any measure which attempts in a more or less decisive way, it may be often in a very blind and wrong way, to re-assert the rights of the universal Lord and His universal human family in politics or in education, or in church discipline? Is it not that it will "interfere with the *sacred* rights of property"? The preacher of the gospel may go a great way in attacking the prejudices of his hearers, and be patiently tolerated; but let him even seem to lay an iconoclastic hand upon their most sacred idol, and he will find that the fanatical intolerance which he has aroused is fundamentally a religious intolerance. What the sepulchre of Jesus Christ was to our fathers in the Middle Ages, property is to us in this age. Christian men destroyed by thousands and thousands the living images of the Son of Man, the creatures for whose redemption He gave Himself to death and was laid in the sepulchre, in order to save His sepulchre from the hands of unbelievers. In the threatened war of classes throughout Christendom—which I believe nothing can avert but the conversion and repentance of the clergy in every Nation, and our

determination to abstain because we are priests from consecrating party, and to reassert our mediatorial function as the social bond of union between all classes—"Property is in danger!" will be the cry which will gather together the middle classes to the battle as to a sacred war. I believe that property is sacred. But why is it sacred? Because "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof;" it belongs to the Sacred One who is at once the Lord and Judge of the rich and of the poor. Its sanctity lies in its Source and Giver; it lies in its relation to the Avenger of its misuses, and not in itself.

The certain rich man in the parable believed that the sanctity of property lay in itself. He worshipped and served it, and not its Giver. He denied that it was God's; for if he had believed that it was His, he would have used it for the help and elevation of God's servant and his own fellow-servant, Lazarus, who lay in want at his gate. This is the creed of the worshipper of this idol—"I believe in gold. Goods are my chief good. What I have is my own; I am its proprietor, not the steward of its proprietor." He may throw a tithe of it now and then to the Lord's family, to satisfy His claims, or secure His favour when it passes to his heirs; he must give the mass of it to the increasing of the kingdom, the power, and the glory of property itself. Property appears to its worshippers, at all events in this world, to be lord and king—to be God's viceroy, as the tempter once pretended on the mountain.

You may recollect that during the late American civil war the cry went up, "Cotton is King." The sympathies of the wealthy classes of England were, I believe, greatly on the side of the South. But all their chivalry, all their military genius, could not gain them the victory. All the defeats and apparent conceits of the North could not keep victory out of their hands. Why? Was it not because the Son of Man, the Head of Humanity, was fighting? The Lord, Who delivered the slaves out of Egypt and gave them the moral law, surely has not ceased to care for the liberation of slaves and the culture of men. Wherever there is a slave or an oppressed creature, there (if the Bible be true) the triumphant Redeemer and Conqueror must always be, and must be fighting on his side. But, some may say, there are many slaves and oppressed creatures for whom God seems never to make bare His holy arm. The champion of the Egyptian peasant-slaves and preacher of glad news to the poor of Jewry reminds us, in the parable, that God is still the Deliverer of the poor after death. They have a Helper, although in this life they seem to have none.

The idols which we adore in the stead of God always become in time our enemies, and bring us into a "place of torment." You may read this in every page of the Old Testament. Because the rich man would not make to himself friends of the property of unrighteousness by bringing it into obedience and service to the Incarnate Righteousness Who is its real owner, and Who demands the use of it in the

persons of His needy creatures and brethren, therefore the rich man's own idolized property became his destroyer. What else is the worship of property but the constant and devoted studying how to do what we will and lust, and not to do what the Lord wills and what His humanity needs with that portion of His goods which He enables us to call our own? The worship of property, or any other idol, is like the worship of the Triune Charity. It is to love *it* "with all thy soul, and all thy heart, and all thy mind, and all thy strength." In Zaccheus we may see how the worshipper of goods is converted into a worshipper of The Good.

III.

In the rich man of this day's Gospel we have also an illustration of the worship of another false god of the English. I do not know whether the idolatry of property, or the idolatry of "respectability," is the more threatening evil in our middle-class national life. The idol property is the rival of God and the invader of His right as universal Lord of things. The idol respectability is His rival as universal Father of men. The rich man of the parable was a worshipper of the idol respectability, instead of a worshipper of the Father, because He refused human communion and fellowship to His brother Lazarus. Class was more sacred to him than common citizenship, more sacred than common Humanity. His class was not on

human terms with the lower classes. It would patronize them, no doubt. It would pay some agent to give them tracts, medicine, and a paltry schooling. It would do anything but turn from its own worship of respectability to the worship of the fellowship of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost by giving them human brotherhood, and demanding for them fellow-citizenship.

We fall into this idolatry when we allow the interests and conventional demands of respectable society, instead of the eternal law of the Gospel, to be the moving force of our political and social life. It was the highest respectability in some ages and places to be irreligious; but in our day and land the worship of this idol is supposed to include some worship of God. The heroes and heroines of religious novels may be Puritan, or may be Anglican in opinion: they may be the one in the first chapter, the other in the last: they are always well born or well bred, and they fare well every day. They are the cousins of Dives, not the brethren of Lazarus. Many a Dives subscribes with his purse, and lends his influence and energy at elections, to the maintaining of "Scriptural religion" or of "the Catholic Faith." Yet the man is a worse enemy to the Faith than any Arian, a profounder denier of the Bible than any sceptic, so long as he is giving to the idol respectability the worship which belongs to the Eternal Charity, to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The rich man in the Gospel called Abraham

his "father." No doubt he always regarded himself as a pious Israelite. But he denied the universal Fatherhood of God; for he refused to see in Lazarus a fellow-child of that Father. He denied by implication the reality of the Incarnation of the Son of God, for he refused to see in Lazarus a fellow-sharer with himself of that universal flesh which is in Christ united with God, in which Christ lived, in which Christ died, in which Christ rose again, in which Christ now sits and reigns at the right hand of the Father. He denied the reality of the Father's gift of His Spirit to "all flesh" by the ascended Son; for he refused to acknowledge in the patience and meekness of Lazarus the presence and the appeal of that common uniting Spirit Who binds together in one the rich and poor children of God, and Who was striving within his own conscience to convince him of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. If we had a keener sense of our own inward heresy and our own inward idolatry, we should be less panic-stricken at the outward attacks made upon the Catholic Faith, we should be less appalled at the sight of any of the novel outward idols which other men may be setting up for worship in the place of the Triune Charity.

The hope of the church and nation of England does not lie in the crushing, or the out-voting, or the out-manœuvring of external foes. It is to apostolic churchmen, I must again remind you, that St. John says, "Keep yourselves from idols." We shall serve God best as churchmen and citizens by dealing

with our home-idols as the prophets of God called the nation of Israel to deal with her successive home-idols. Every idol is the god of a class, the god of a section or a party: every idol is therefore a divider of the Humankind, and of those divine fellowships of nation and family which the Trinity in Unity has instituted and sanctified. If we worship property or mammon, we may be pleasing our own class; but we are helping to degrade and ruin our nation, we are setting up an idol on the altar of our family. If we worship respectability, we are helping to drive farther and farther apart the classes which the Father has made one nation and church in His Son. On high and low, rich and poor alike, however they think they ought to differ, God has bestowed through His Son, Who was at once the King and a carpenter, His own common uniting Spirit. It is our calling as soldiers of His universal society, to follow Jesus Christ our King and Leader in His evangelical crusade against the idol-worshipping which now in Europe, as of old in Israel, is the forerunner of national and ecclesiastical humiliation. We are no more called to be adulators of the poor than adulators of the rich; but it is our business to bear testimony to all alike, that the Uncreated Charity, the true God Whose Name the Church is bound to preach to "every creature" and to "all nations," is not the God of a party, the God of a clique, or the God of a class, but the uniter of classes and the foe and destroyer of parties and cliques.

XIX.

THE EXCUSES WHICH CHRISTIANS OFFER TO GOD FOR NOT ENTERING INTO FELLOWSHIP WITH HIM AND HUMANITY.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, JUNE 9, 1872.

ST. LUKE xiv. 16—18.

"A certain man made a great supper, and bade many: and sent his servant at supper time to say to them that were bidden, Come; for all things are now ready. And they all with one consent began to make excuse."

WE must not confound this parable with the very similar parable related by St. Matthew in the 22nd chapter of his Gospel, and adopted by the Church as the Holy Gospel for the twentieth Sunday after Trinity. That parable was delivered by our blessed Lord in Jerusalem on the Tuesday of the last week of His life on earth; this, earlier in His ministry, while journeying towards Jerusalem. That was spoken in public; this, at the private supper-table of a chief pharisee on the Sabbath-day. In that parable a king invites a number of inferiors to the wedding-feast of his son; in this, a certain man invites a

number of neighbours to a supper. The final point of that parable is placed in the rude and impertinent unfitness of one of the guests, who complies with the letter but not with the spirit of the invitation; he sits down without a wedding garment. The final point of this parable is placed in the effect of the determination of the giver of the feast that "his house may be filled." At many stages of their story the parables run together; they both agree in the hint, so significant to the pharisees and the Jewish hearers, that in each case the first invited guests despise the invitation and are self-excluded from the feast. The first invited guests behave more atrociously in the parable in St. Matthew's Gospel than in this: they kill the king's apostles or messengers, and are punished with death and the destruction of their city. In this parable they only insult the host by their neglect, and he merely punishes them by leaving them to themselves, and supplying the feast to which they were called with new guests, first from the lowest classes in the city, and then from the social outcasts and vagabonds outside the city. The final word of judgment in this parable is uttered by the lord to his servant in the 24th verse: "I say unto you, that none of those men that were bidden shall taste of my supper."

As this parable is the earlier, the other may perhaps be said to be a development of it. A more terrible issue was brought forward by the Lord on the Tuesday before His death, when the purpose of the Jewish

leaders to destroy the Son of God had become more fixed and definite. At present, yearning over those over whom He has not yet allowed himself to weep, He keeps back all mention of the destruction of the murderers and the burning of the city.

I have thought some statement of the distinction of the parables from each other to be necessary, because I wish you to fix your minds upon the idea presented to us in the opening of to-day's parable. "A certain man made a great supper and bade many." Feast-giving is the subject of the whole chapter from the 1st verse to the 25th. The Lord Himself on this Sabbath-day was a guest. He had already "put forth a parable to those which were bidden" as His fellow-guests, "when He marked how they chose out the chief rooms." He had set before them His divine idea of "a dinner or a supper" as a feast grounded on a sacrifice. "Call not thy friends, nor thy brethren neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbours; lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." A fellow-guest, as he heard Jesus speak, and thought of that wonderful union of all classes in one fellowship into which Jesus had just invited the pharisees to enter, suddenly cried out in rapture, "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God." It was to this rapturous enthusiast that Jesus spake the

parable: "Then said He *unto him*, a certain man made a great supper, and bade many."

This "certain man," I need scarcely say, represents God. God as the Triune Charity—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—yearns to have all creatures in willing fellowship, invites all creatures into fellowship. We have been lately called by the return of Trinity Sunday to contemplate and adore the mystery of the Fellowship of the Divine Unity. The Church now turns our thoughts to the life we are living on earth, and urges us to strive to make our common life more and more a fellowship with the Father in Jesus Christ by yielding ourselves to the government of the Holy Spirit, Who tells us we are the children of God, and a fellowship with one another in Jesus Christ, Who as the Son of Man binds men together in one Humanity. The subject falls naturally into two divisions: (1) The Invitation which God sends to Christian men and women; (2) The way in which we Christians behave to our Inviter, and treat His Invitation.

I.

God is so eager to bless mankind that He has, according to the imagery of His Son, *made a great supper*. Jesus, as the Revealer of the Unseen, gives us a glimpse into the marvellous character of the thoughts of God when He is thinking about us sinners; and what He shews us (here as everywhere

else) is that they are exactly the opposite of the fancies of the natural man about the thoughts of God. If the natural carnal man was writing a parable of the Kingdom of God, it would begin rather in this fashion: "A certain man made a great fire, into which he determined to cast many;" or, "A certain man made a great prison, in which he resolved to immure many." But that which God has really prepared for us, and to which He really calls us, can best be truly presented to simple minds (in the judgment of the Incarnate Wisdom) under the image of a great supper.

The parable of the Kingdom of God lay visibly before the eyes of the Lord as He was teaching. The table at which he was sitting was no doubt narrow and exclusive: it belonged to one of the class which was scandalized at the Son of God for eating with publicans and sinners. But the table of the Lord of all is "great"—for the seats at it are utterly innumerable. The feast of God is "great"—for the utmost satisfaction of the righteous hunger and thirst of each human spirit is provided for by it. Every age, every kind of appetite, every degree of moral health, is foreseen and anticipated by the Love of God. The provision which the Eternal Love has made for His human race is not only "great," but it is called in this parable "*a supper*." Our English word gives no indication of the time. But a supper is the last meal of the day; as Luther translated it in this text, it is *ein Abendmahl*—an evening meal. An earlier Saxon

theologian, Ludolph the Carthusian prior of Strassburg, placed the point of the parable in this: "Supper," he says, "is only prepared for the declining day, after which no later refection awaits men."* In the evening men have a right to sit down; their conscience sets them free; the work of the day is over: it has been an honest and whole day's work; the hour has come when body and soul demand refreshment and rest. The invited guests know that none of the sacred hours of work will be broken into, no day's integrity will be dislocated, by accepting the host's invitation. The working day ought to have closed at the hour of the supper celebration. Each man should have done with his merely individual part in the world's work—his business cares and his family cares—and be ready to enter with a restful, untrammeled, and uncarking abandonment into the fellowship of his host and of all his fellow-guests. "The great supper" to which the many are called is a witness to each guest that he belongs in the idea of God not only to himself, not only to his family and household, but to Humanity, to his fellow-guests, and to God, his generous and loving Host.

For this man's "great supper" is of course a parable of the Lord's greater Supper. I do not here mean the Eucharist. The parable no doubt throws

* "Quæ vocatur cœna, eo quod est refectio ultima. Cœna paratur declinante die, post quam nulla refectio sequitur."—*Vita Jesu Christi*, i. p. 734.

light upon the Eucharist as a feast made by God for men, and throws light also upon the refusals which men send back to God in return for His invitation to His sacramental feast. But the "Great Supper" which God has made for man includes not only the Eucharist, but everything else which can possibly be brought within the term of "eating bread in the Kingdom of God." For we must throughout recollect that this is the text of the parable, "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the Kingdom of God." The invitation to His supper is God's call to man to enter into fellowship with Him and into rest with Him. The parable was His Son's sabbatic call to the pharisaic and self-separated guests to cease from their own works and enter with their fellow-citizens into God's common Sabbath of rest. It is His call to us who are Christians to enter into human fellowship with the whole mass of mankind in Him. This supper is the exposition of God's yearning desire that we shall all enter into unity with Him, and in Him with one another. God is revealed to us by His Son through this parable as burning with the divine discontent of Charity until He sees His table filled with guests. They who thought themselves God's dearest guests, the keepers of His Sabbath, had violated that Sabbath by grudging salvation from dropsy to the poor wretch who had presented him to the Saviour at their Sabbath meal. The Maker of the Great Supper is of quite a contrary mind. "Go out into the highways and hedges and com-

pel them to come in, that My House may be filled." The Inviter is a Redeemer of the outcast classes.

II.

The Lord, however, does not dwell upon the consideration of the Host and His feast. He turns quickly to the conduct of the guests who were first invited. "They all with one consent began to make excuse. The first said unto him" (that is to the apostle or legate of the feast-giver), "I have bought a piece of ground, and I must needs go and see it: I pray thee have me excused. And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and go to prove them: I pray thee have me excused." They asked God's own apostle and minister to intercede for them with God for their insulting refusal to enter into the great fellowship to which God invited them. "And another said, I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come."

I shall confine myself to the consideration of the first invited guests, the nearer friends of the Host, because they alone amongst the invited ones are *our* representatives. The conscience of the Jewish hearers no doubt recognized in these rich and thankless guests the picture of themselves. They were already by their childhood to Abraham and their holy circumcision near to God. They were the chosen friends of Almighty God. The great supper was made

for them. The *hora cœnæ*, the supper-time, was the rest which was remaining for the People of God. But when God, by the appearing of His Son, invited His own friends and acquaintances to the great supper in which God and Humanity (Jew and Gentile, pharisee and publican, Christian and man) met in one fellowship, they refused to come. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not." They were like their fathers in the wilderness, who hardened their hearts, and entered not into His rest in Canaan. So after His ascension, when He invited them again, by the Whitsuntide outpouring of His one uniting Spirit upon all flesh and by the call of the Apostles, to enter into fellowship with Him and all peoples in the unity of the Church, they refused to repent and be baptized. It was then that God sent His rejected invitation to the Samaritans and to the Heathen, and filled the House of His Christendom with the uncircumcised Nations.

If this parable is to have as quick a meaning for our age as it had for those who heard it in the first century, it is plain that we who are christened churchgoers and communicants must regard ourselves as belonging to the class who reject the invitation of the God of all to enter into fellowship with Him and with the fellow-guests He calls to His great supper. We are the invited ones—we who live within the very heart of the City and Kingdom of God. The Lord has not to send His ministers out into the streets and lanes of schism or heresy, or into the highways

and hedges of unbelief and heathenism, in order to find us. We, therefore—church-goers, communicants, contenders for the faith—must look within ourselves for the persons who offer to God excuses for not fully entering into the great fellowship with Him and with our brethren to which He is bidding us.

What kept back the guests of the parable from accepting the noble invitation of the Lord? The new land of one, the new oxen of another, the new wife of a third—the latest and most novel acquirements of secular business, the latest calls of family business. Each was too busy to enter into the rest to which the Father of all called him. Each was too absorbed in *his own* narrow private concerns, and *his own* narrow family concerns, to claim and take the place which the gracious and loving Lord of all had allotted to him in the Great Supper, *the Universal* Fellowship. The mediæval verse says, "The villa, the farm, the oxen, the wife, shut out the called ones from the supper: the world, anxiety, and the flesh shut out the born-again ones from heaven."*

The supper, however, to which God calls us is not "heaven." The selfish man in our own selves, already too prompt to seek what we think our own good, would not shrink from any sacrifice to gain so great a prize. There can be small doubt that the pharisees who heard this promise would gladly have sacrificed

* "Villa, boves, uxor, Cœnam clausere vocatis;
Mundus, cura, caro, Cælum clausere renatis."
LUDOLPHUS SAXO, *Vita Jesu*, p. 755.

land and oxen and wife, if by the sacrifice they could have been sure of gaining the richer goods of heaven. The Lord's Great Supper is *fellowship with God and with all Mankind* in and by Him who sacrificed Himself, Who gave up heaven, Who gave up His own life. Besides, it would be the height of impiety in our age, after all the lessons He has taught us in the process of history, to suppose that the divine Husband of the Church, Who has joined Himself with our whole flesh, identifies *matrimonium* and *caro*, marriage and the flesh, in the sense of the ascetics.

The excuses of all the recusants proceeded from their own inward dissympathy with the mind of their inviter. They did not want fellowship with the many: they wanted gain for their own bodies and their own souls. Their excuses proceeded from the delusion,—common in Jewry, not unknown in Christendom,—that the duties and relations of life are merely secular, that they have nothing to do with God and His fellowship, that they are in some sort hindrances to our entering into His fellowship, instead of being our very means of entering more fully into it. Surely, the buying of land ought not to be secular; for "the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." The traffic of daily life ought not to be secular; for every man with whom we traffic is a fellow-guest whom the Father has called together with us, by the universal Humanity of His Son, to the supper of rest and fellowship. The marrying of a wife ought not to be secular; for God's prophets perceived in marriage

the completest parable of the fellowship into which He entered with Israel by the covenant of circumcision; the apostles could find no completer parable of the fellowship into which He entered with the Church of the whole human race through the sacrament of Baptism.

What is it which really makes Divine gifts and relations secular? Our habit of separating them in our thoughts from God and Humanity. To be looking every one "on his own things," and not on the things of God, which are the things of all men; to be absorbed in the business and relations of life *as our own* things; to disconnect any one of them from the general life of Humanity, and from the one God and Father of all; to be ever saying and thinking, "*I* have bought," and "*I* have married," —it is this self-regarding habit which makes Divine gifts and relations secular; it is this contemplation of them from self as centre, instead of from the Father of All as centre. It is self which makes us turn the gifts of God and the relationships which have their ground in His Fatherhood into excuses for refusing God's invitation to the universal fellowship.

So long as self-interest—whether for this world or for any other world—is the centre of our activity, it matters not *what kind* of activity we offer to God as our excuse for not entering into that universal fellowship with Him and with the many to which He calls us. You and I perhaps may not say, "I have bought land, I have increased my stock, I have to look after

my kindred, and therefore I cannot come." But we may be tempted to say to the Giver of the Feast, "I am going to church, and therefore I cannot come; I have received holy orders, and therefore I cannot come; I am going to give my time to religious exercises, and therefore I cannot come; I am trying to save my soul, and therefore I cannot come." The soul's redemption, religious exercises, the worship of the Church, the gift of orders, yea, the whole Catholic Church itself, one and all exist—as the old Church and old city which God has destroyed were existing when the Judge was giving forth this parable—in order that they may be means to the Great End which the Eternal Love set before Himself in making the world and in redeeming man's whole kind. As Mankind's Redeemer told His old Church on the Sabbath, that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, so He is telling His present Church in manifold ways that the Church is made for Humanity. We have not made our full entry into fellowship with God as Christians, neither do we sup with Him, nor He with us, unless we are striving to make our full entry through Him into fellowship with all our fellowmen as men.

XX.

THE FALSE FELLOWSHIPS TO WHICH THE RELIGIOUS WORLD INVITES THE MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSAL FELLOWSHIP.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, JUNE 16, 1872.

1 ST. PETER v. 5.

"All of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility."

FELLOWSHIP has been the subject upon which I have spoken to you on the last three Sundays. First, on Trinity Sunday, I reminded you that we adore our One God as the Triune Fellowship of The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. On the next Sunday, we looked together at two of the idols whom men of our class are specially tempted to substitute for the Divine Fellowship, and to worship instead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—the false gods, Property and Respectability, whose worship breaks up the fellowships of family, nation, and church, which the Ever-Blessed Trinity has established for men. Last Sunday, we glanced at some of the excuses which we Christians and Churchmen

offer to God for not entering at once into that fellowship with Him and all men to which He calls us.

I.

A very slight glance at the Epistle and Gospel for this week will be enough to shew you that Fellowship—first, with God, and then in Him with one another and with all men—is still the subject which underlies them. The humility to which the apostle (who had himself fallen from this fellowship with Jesus Christ) to-day calls us, is the means of preserving the sense of our fellowship both with God and with one another. Pride drives us, as it drove the prodigal, to set up for ourselves, independently of God: pride tears to pieces the bonds of fellowship by which God binds us to each other. We cannot but think, the more we consider ourselves as we have made ourselves, that the "God of all grace" might indeed have refused to send His Only Son in our nature and to re-call beings like us into the eternal Fellowship. Yet St. John says, "truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ." "Hereby," he says, "we know that He dwelleth in us by the Spirit which He hath given us." The Spirit of the Perfect Charity does not refuse to dwell with us who are so contrary to our Divine Indwelling Fellow, who provoke Him every day, and probably every hour, who treat the

most paltry and short-lived gains and triumphs on earth as more precious than God's eternal Fellowship, by which we live and move and have our being.

In the Epistle for the day, St. Peter lays it down as the fundamental fact of our life, that "the God of all grace hath called *us* into His eternal glory in Christ Jesus." "Eternal"—for this glory, in which The Love Who made us and redeemed us desires we should have a share, is nothing less than the glory, as the Son says, which He had in His Fellowship with the Father before the world was made. All that this glory is, all that it fully means, the most perfect saint or angel can have of course but a feeble and glimmering perception: but this is the gospel which God sends us to announce to mankind, that the Eternal Charity burns to communicate a share of it to every sinner. St. Paul tells the Church that God ordained him an apostle that he might make it his business "*to make all men see* what is the Fellowship of the Mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, Who created all things by Jesus Christ." Hence when He by Whom the Eternal Charity is manifested to men, and in Whom the glory of the Godhead dwells bodily, came into the world, "all the publicans and sinners" (as the Gospel to-day tells us) "drew near unto Him for to hear Him." Although they could not yet realize, or could only feebly realize God in the Person of The Son, they could perceive that the whole life and character and acts of Jesus, as well as His words,

invited *them* one and all, sinners though they were, to enter into fellowship with Him. They could not indeed yet know that He was "the head of every man." But they could see, according to their measure of insight, that He had come forth from God to be a head of every man, and to lead every man into fellowship with God. They could see, that though He called disciples and gathered an elect society about Him, yet He was not the mere master of a new religious school, not the mere head of a new godly party, not the mere founder of a better sect than any of the sects existing in the midst of them.

II.

St. Luke gives us a glimpse in to-day's Gospel of one of the false and limited fellowships which we men naturally incline to substitute for the Eternal and Universal Fellowship into which Jesus Christ invites men. "The pharisees and the scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." The religious world founds fellowships of its own which it mistakes for the Divine Fellowship. The Jewish sects were such fellowships. Sects are not founded like the catholic Church on the Incarnation—that is, on the already existing fellowship of the Godhead and the whole Humankind in Jesus Christ. Pharisaism, the only one of the sects with which we are to-day concerned, was founded on the basis of the assumed personal piety of its fellows,

on the unlikeness of each member of the fellowship to the mass of his circumcised brethren. It could only profess to receive those who were not sinners: by its very constitution it could not afford to eat with publicans. If the Son of God would but have driven away the sinners who dared to approach Him, if He would but have made proofs of personal *piety* instead of common *Humanity*—personal persuasion of conversion instead of common flesh and blood — the ground and title to fellowship with God in Him, the sect would not improbably have accepted Him as its Head and its Messiah-King. It hated and opposed Him because He identified Himself with all Humanity — because He shewed that it was of the essence of His mission to ignore their separation of men into the religious and the irreligious. It at last pursued Him to death for His completion of His testimony to the union of God and man in His person by identifying Himself with God. The sect would have welcomed a new Abraham or a new Moses. It was compelled to reject, if it meant to remain a sect, one in whom the conscience recognized a new Adam. It hated Him at first for declaring with power that He was very Man; it hated Him at last for completing the declaration of His Perfect Manhood by declaring that He was very God. "The pharisees and scribes murmured," says the evangelist. The determination of the sect to destroy the Son of Man began in this murmur.

The religious world quickly recognized in the Son

of Man, and it still is quick to recognize in those who represent Man the greatest of its enemies. Cæsar and his prefects may hate it because it troubles the State and disturbs the people. The Sadducees may hate it because it interferes with the spread of critical intelligence. The mass of the Nation and of Humanity may hate it because it is always either deliberately contrahuman and antinational or is negatively un-national and inhuman. It can, however, patch up temporary alliances with all these temporary enemies: with the Sadducees to entrap Jesus Christ; with Cæsar to get Jesus Christ condemned; with the common mob and mass of men to overawe Cæsar into making law a mockery. But with the Son of God, the Head of the Church and the Saviour of the World, it can make no alliance. He refuses to enter into the false fellowship of a presumed common piety and common religion into which they would entice Him by their language.

"Why eatest *Thou*," they say emphatically to our blessed Lord, "with sinners? We know that Thou art like us, not like our opponents, the incredulous Sadducees; Thou art not like this ungodly or semi-infidel mob. Thou carest, as we do, for God and religion; and Thou teachest the way of God in truth. Will it not, therefore, prejudice Thy position, and hinder Thy great work, if Thou seekest fellowship with the infidel and ungodly, as if Thou wert one of them?"

In the Gospel for last Sunday we saw the Son of

God sitting at table with the religious: He severely blamed and upbraided them. In to-day's Gospel we see Him eating with the scum and riffraff of Jerusalem: He invites them tenderly by three marvellous parables to enter into the fellowship which they one and all have with God through His Humanity. He tells them that they are sheep strayed from God's flock. He tells each one that he is a piece of money stamped with God's die. He tells them that they belong to a family; they are prodigal sons running away by evil deeds from God their own Father. The Head of the universal Church cannot have fellowship with the heads of Sects on the ground that they are the religious men. If He has fellowship with them, it must be on the same ground as He has it with all the publicans and sinners: it must be on the ground that they are men. It must be on the ground of the common universal Humanity of pharisee and publican, of godly men and sinners, which he has assumed by His birth of the Virgin Mary, whose universal disease He has come to heal. It is for the physician to judge what diseases are worst and most fatal. The diseases of the publicans and sinners were horrible and deadly. But it is certain from every line of the Gospels that the Divine Physician regarded the diseases of the religious world as infinitely more horrible and more deadly; not indeed as hopeless, for He healed a Nicodemus, and He healed a Saul.

It is the faith of the Church in the perfect Manhood of the Son of God—a faith implied in the character of

the Church, if not always realized—which makes it impossible for any of Christ's sent clergy, who have a true conception of their function, to join with the ministers of the sects of the current religious world as "fellow-ministers of the Gospel." We may seem to the pharisee to be illiberal and narrow, and even irreligious, because we stand thus aloof. But it is because the basis of the real historical Church is so much broader and more liberal than the basis of the phantasmal "churches" of sectarian invention and institution, that the clergy of the Church are obliged to stand aloof. For it is treachery to the Son of God as The Man and as the Head of a catholic or human-universal Church, and it is treachery to the publicans and sinners whom He is always calling into His fellowship, to pretend that the Church and the Sects have a bond of union in an undefined set of religious opinions which it is the fashion to call "our common Christianity," or the "religion of the Bible," or "Undenominationalism." It is faithless to God and to men to pretend that such a bond can be closer than that bond of the common Humanity of the Son of God, which is binding the Catholic Church of all ages and nations to all those publicans and sinners whom the Sects are obliged by their generic principle to regard only as godless and infidel; though, indeed, they may look upon them as very useful as possessors of votes, and may at times use their voices against the Church and against Humanity, as the Jewish sects gladly used the voices of the despised publicans or

sinners against the Head of the Church and the Head of every man on Good Friday.

III.

I do not only speak of these things because the true Universal Fellowship and the false fellowships are contrasted so vividly in the week's Eucharistic Epistle and Gospel, but because this week the priests of the Church of England are invited to combine with the teachers of English Sects in a newly invented fellowship called the *Christian Evidence Society*. We are asked to urge you as English churchmen to subscribe to its funds.

The invitation is headed, "The Spread of Infidelity." The inventors of this new fellowship propose to send out the ministers of Jesus Christ and the disciples of the Sects in common to lecture against so much infidelity, and against that sort of rationalism which is found outside the Church and the puritan and methodist Sects. The notion underlying the scheme is in effect that which underlay the virtual proposal of the pharisees to the Head of the Church and the Head of every man. It is proposed that we should utterly invert the meaning and spirit of our divine call or ordination, by condemning as infidel and ungodly all the publicans and sinners who do not yet belong to the Church or to the puritan and methodist Sects of Protestantism. I say, "to the puritan and methodist sects," for I imagine that the

fellowship would be rudely shaken by the question, Whether Protestants who are not "evangelical" are believers or unbelievers, friends or foes?

A "spread of infidelity" cannot but be a serious concern to the ministers of that fellowship which is called especially the "Household of Faith." But infidelity, from the apostolical and catholic point of view, is seen to have a deeper root, and to cover a far larger range of human life and thought, than it can seem to have or to cover to the churchmen and the members of Sects who now try to find a common point of view for surveying it, and mean to labour together at uprooting it. St. Peter says, in this Epistle to the Household of Faith, "All of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility." Humility will quicken us to the acknowledgment of our own infidelity, to the confession of our own interior departure from the faith, to the detection of our own rationalistic preferences of our judgment to the Eternal Reason, Who came out of the bosom of the Father to shew all men and women that they are God's sons and daughters. When we have clothed ourselves with humility, we shall begin to make the confession that we ourselves are the lost sheep, the lost money, the prodigal sons of God. This humility, as I said in the beginning of the sermon, is the right means for maintaining our right place in His Fellowship. It is also a likelier means than our boasting of our faith for drawing the publicans and sinners into it. The publicans and sinners

drew near to Jesus Christ because the divine magnetism of His character perforce attracted them. They will draw near to the fellowship which He has left for them in the earth, to the catholic Church, in proportion as their conscience and reason are sensible of His same magnetic presence in the life of His Church. If the presence of Jesus—the attractor of persons we might have called infidel publicans had we lived in Jewry—is not seen by them at this day in the Church in England, is it not because by our self-assertions we shew so much of our own presence and our own spirit in it? Humility is the very business of the churchman, priest or layman. Our study to clothe ourselves with humility, our own depression, each in himself, of the selfish spirit in the Church, will make room and arena for the manifestation of the Spirit Who dwells within us, the Spirit of the sacrificer of Himself, the Spirit of Him Who by the attractive force of His Godhead and Manhood wherever and whenever He is seen must draw perforce all the publicans and sinners of Humanity to hear Him. Our business as members of the Church, therefore, is not to enter into fellowship with the pharisees; it is not to attack the exterior infidelity of any special English publicans and English sinners; but it is to fight against that inward infidelity in our hearts and thoughts which is an indirect cause of the infidelity of those who are both outside the Church and outside the Sects. It is our business to bear witness to those whom the Sects

and sectarians in the Church call infidels, and to the Sects themselves, by the preaching of the Apostolic Gospel of which a Reconciling Father is the subject, and by the perpetual maintaining of a Catholic Worship of which the Sacrifice for all the sins of the whole world is the centre—that Jesus Christ has founded His Church for publicans and sinners, and not for pharisees—or only for pharisees when they take themselves down to the common plain of Humanity upon which the publicans and sinners stand, upon which God's Son chose to stand.

But, apart from this, there is only one form of infidelity on which the amalgamated lecturers, after they have confounded the divine boundary which separates the Church from the Sects, can agree to make common attack. It is the unbelief of the understanding. They agree, for instance, to give "evidence" to infidels that miracles are possible. But if it be infidelity to disbelieve that the Son of Man raised up the bedridden body and made it whole, are the amalgamated lecturers to agree that it is faith to disbelieve that the same Son of Man any longer exercises upon earth His power to forgive sins? Are they to teach that it is faith to disbelieve that He still gives to His ministers the power which He once declared that He gave them? If it be infidelity to disbelieve that He fed five thousand persons with a few loaves, is it faith to disbelieve that the bread which He gives us is His body, and the wine which He gives us is His blood? Can we call it infidelity

to deny the inspiration of the writers of the Bible, and then pretend that it is faith to deny the perpetual inspiration of the catholic Church? I mean by the Church the totality of Christians, and not merely the clergy, the bishops, or the Roman bishop. A permanent fellowship between the catholic or human Church and the religionist Sects in a common crusade against the infidelity of the understanding is impossible. The strange allies must in time at some part of the battle turn to war against each other—perhaps in a casual reference to the Office for the Visitation of the Sick publicans and sinners of England in the English Common-Prayer Book, in which the priest is to claim those Englishmen as children of God whom the sects are bound to consider as unconverted children of the devil.

There remains, indeed, one argument which to my mind is most fatal of all against this hollow fellowship. It is that I myself, as a priest of the Catholic and National Church, already feel in infinitely closer fellowship with the English publicans and sinners whom the pharisees and the sects of our land and all lands stigmatize as godless and infidel than I can ever feel (so long as I believe the Gospel and the Creeds) with the pharisees and the sects themselves. We see in the Holy Gospel that the Head of the Church refused to enter the fellowship of the Sects that He might be able to bear witness to the publicans and sinners of the Universal Fellowship which they had as men and women with God in His

Humanity. He came not to call the self-ticketed righteous and converted, but the sinners to repentance. I do not expect to be saved as a godly righteous man; I expect to be saved only as a penitent sinner. I do not expect to be saved as a good sheep which has kept its own place in the fold, and is superior to the mass of the Shepherd's flock, and unlike the mass, but as one which the Shepherd has brought back from bad and wilful wandering, and restored by His charity and His work to its right place.

This day's Gospel, and indeed the entire remainder of St. Luke's fifteenth chapter, is an apology for God to men made by the Son of God. It is the exposition of the method in which "the Author of our Faith" arrests "the spread of infidelity." It does not need more than a very slight glance at it to see how marvellously it differs from those evidences of Christianity which are our favourite methods of trying to "arrest the spread of infidelity," but which have never had much success.

To oppose with all our might the false and pharisaic notion of "the Church" upon which every puritan and methodist Sect has based its narrow fellowship, which it puts forth as its apology for its departure from the universal or human fellowship of Christ's Church,—this, my brethren, must be our right way of opposing "the spread of infidelity." If we lower our faith in the vocation and the powers given to us by the Holy Ghost in holy orders, if we pretend that the ministry of the Sects has as such any kind of

validity, we are merely subsidising one kind and degree of unbelief in order that it may help us in fighting another kind and another degree. This will possibly earn for us a temporary applause from the secular prophets of the newspapers, because it will look like liberality; but nothing can be at bottom so essentially illiberal. For to accept as so-called *Christians* (the pharisees having given us their diploma that we are genuine believers) the wretched fellowship of Sects which divide mankind and the nation, we must more or less reject that universal fellowship which we already have as *men* with the publicans and sinners (whom the Sects would proselytize) in the universal manhood of the Head of the Church.

Further, we cannot forget that multitudes of these prodigal sons, in whom the pharisees can see nothing but godless infidels, are already our brethren in the Church by the sacrament of Baptism. It is our business not to convince them that they are nothing but orphans, but to call them back to their own Father and to their own home. But to do this effectually we must, in the humility of Jesus Christ, put ourselves on their level. We must confess in our doctrine and life (as we do in our words in our daily worship) that we also (every morning and every evening, and all the time that lies between) have erred and strayed from the Universal Shepherd's ways, and that we also are rebelling against the will and the laws of their Father and ours.

Last of all, we must remember that not only in

the humanity and the universality which difference the doctrine of the Church from the doctrines of Sects, but also in the great beliefs and hopes which keep apart the publicans and rationalistic sinners from the beliefless and hopeless Pharisaism which seeks to proselytize them, the Church has points of affinity with the doubters and the self-called "advanced thinkers" in all ages which she can never have with the pharisaic Sects. Their ideals of the future, all their wildest thoughts and most revolutionary schemes, embrace Humanity (as the catholic Church does) as a whole. They care for a Nation (as each national Church does) as a whole. Many of their most revolutionary words and methods are nothing more than the wild and eager protest of the redeemed conscience and reason of Humanity against the false and narrow theories which the reign of Pharisaism has taught men to identify with the Kingdom of Jesus Christ. It is less our business to attack their negative theories, though that may indeed be in certain circumstances the work to which individual priests or laymen are called, than to exhibit the True Kingdom and Fellowship of Jesus Christ in its positive form and fulness. The Church of all ages, as the Household of Faith, is the great argument of God against the infidelity of each particular age. Each of us must study to be able to say, in his order and degree, in the words of the Doctor of the Nations, "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should pro-

claim among the Nations the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to make all men see what is the Fellowship of the Mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ, to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord, in whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of Him."

XXI.

THE COMPASSION OF MANKIND A SIGN OF THE COMPASSION OF MANKIND'S HEAD AND LORD.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

ST. LUKE vii. 12, 13.

"And much people of the city was with her. And when the Lord saw her, He had compassion on her."

EVERY reader of the Holy Gospel must perceive at once the contrast between the two compassions of which the bereaved and desolate mother was the subject. The evangelist seems to bring forward their unlikeness by his successive statements of the presence of the citizens and the presence of the Lord at the funeral. He first shews us the helpless compassion of the multitude who follow the mother and the corpse: "Much people of the city was with her." They did what little they could for her; but in the presence of her stupendous grief we must feel (at least every one who in later ages has loved and lost must feel) that one may as well call that little nothing. She wants her son. They cannot give him

back to her. They have not only to mourn his loss, but also their own powerlessness to do more than mourn.

The evangelist, however, does not stay to make such moralisings. He passes straight to that other compassion of which every sonless widow is the subject. He proves his title to be an evangelist by announcing to mankind the joyful tidings of the mighty compassion of Him who meets the mother and the corpse. He leaves us free to dwell upon the contrast; he does not himself dwell upon it. St. Luke, indeed, conjoins the two compassions—the helpless compassion of the mass of men, the mighty compassion of the Son of Man: he does not disjoin and sever them. He brings together the compassion of the citizens and the compassion of the Lord by an "and," not by a "but." "*And* when the Lord saw her, He" also "had compassion on her." He does not ask us to notice how unlike the Son of Man is in His strength to other men in their weakness. He asks us to see how like them He is in His compassion. He thus gives us the hint that these are not merely two compassions, but that the compassion of the members of Humanity and the compassion of the Head are in a deeper sense than that of similarity the two parts of one compassion. May I not say that he shews us that it is not a stranger to pitying and dying Humanity, but the very Head of that pitying and dying Humanity, who meets the mourners and the corpse in the person of Jesus Christ?

I.

The first evangelical thought we should gather from this Gospel is that the Father sent His Son into the world to adopt and justify these common and daily human compassions, and to reveal what had all along been implied although hidden in them. A great sorrow brings to the surface that fundamental kinship which we human creatures have to one another in Jesus Christ our pitying Head. The moment the widow has lost her only son she finds that she has a whole city full of pitying and kindly friends. It is true that this friendship may not last long, or rather may not continue always to exhibit itself. But the presence of death, which is the providence of the Lord of life, has called it forth,; it has revealed that it is there; and that revelation once made remains a possession and a consolation for ever. Bereaved widows must not want to keep its manifestation always; that manifestation will be wanted by other sufferers. The manifestation has been made; it has shewn that there *is* one common heart of love and pity in the Humankind; it has hinted that men and women are brothers and sisters; it has told the sufferer in Nain that she belongs to a whole family. But a family is only a figure of speech, unless there be a Father. The manifestation of the common heart and common compassion in a crisis of mercy or of loss must have often given the sufferer some glimpse of One who is

constituting mankind a family; of One, in "whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." The evangelist tells us that there is such a One. He tells who He is. He tells us that He joined Himself to the mourners in the gate of Nain, that He adopted their compassion, that He took from it its helplessness and imperfection, and substituted His almighty and perfect compassion. He made this funeral, by the revelation of his compassion at it, the crisis of human funerals to the end of time.

It is the revelation of the compassion of God and Man in Jesus Christ with all the troubled, and not the subsequent seal and witness of it by the restoration of the young man to life, which is our subject. It is a gospel to be assured that the Word of God is the Lord in the realms of death; that in whatever sphere or condition the departed now are, they hear and obey there the voice of Him to whom the dead ears and departed spirit of that youth listened when He said, "Young man, I say unto thee, Arise!" But is it not also a truly evangelical revelation to be shewn the very root and origin of the treasury of kindness and compassion and respect, which has been stored up by God in the common human heart of the "much people of the city"? Nothing, I believe, discloses this treasure which our race possesses in Jesus Christ more readily than a funeral; not indeed by the sight of the corpse and the thought of the departed, but by the sight of the bereaved and the thought of their

loss. A funeral may shew this to us; but a funeral does not shew us the secret and reason of it. The evangelist believed and preached, the Church believes and preaches, that the secret and reason were laid bare before men when Jesus Christ met the funeral crowd in the gates of Nain, and took upon Himself their compassion, and superadded His omnipotent compassion. Jesus Christ joined Himself to the compassionate mourners, that His Church might declare to all nations, and to all families of the earth, that wherever human compassion and mourning are, there He, the Son of God, is present; that wherever desolation is laying low great human hopes, and death is spoiling the splendid human mechanism, there He who is the Lord of all, the Lord of the dead, is present.

II.

Jesus Christ shared in the compassion of the Jewish mourners, and shares now in such compassion everywhere, because He is the Son of Man. That very name which declares Jesus to be the head of Humanity implies that He does more than share in our compassions; He admits us to share in His. If we realize that He is our new Adam, the head of every man, we shall rather say that whenever we are showing our part of the common human kindness and respect, He is giving us a share in His compassion. Our first Adam was created in His image as

"the Son of God.' He took the disfigured image upon Himself in the womb of the Virgin. If mankind can be *re*generated into the likeness of the Son of God —that is, can be *again* generated—that must be the likeness in which we were originally generated. There can be nothing good in men which does not proceed from God the only source of all goodness; nothing can be human or humane, in the most perfect sense of these words, which does not come from the Man. All the evil which comes out of our hearts is their own: all the good which comes out of them comes from the heart of the Son of Man. If the heart of our race has a deep fund of compassion in it, it is because the entirety of our Humanity has been taken by Him "Who loved us and gave Himself for us." What a distant and feeble glimpse our reason and conscience must have had as yet of "the mystery" of the Incarnation, unless we see that the common heart which throbs through all the race, whose divine pulsations shew themselves at times even in the hardest, can be nothing less than the Heart of Jesus! If, indeed, in our theories of the Incarnation, we are substituting our limited name "Son of Mary" for the evangelical and catholic name "Son of Man" by which Jesus calls Himself, if with the Unitarian and Ultramontanist we are merely thinking of Jesus as *a* Man amongst other men—different from mankind because He is God, or because He is the best possible of men—and not above all as *the* Man in all men, then we may

* St. Luke iii. 38. "Adam, which was the son of God."

think it rational in our fellow-citizens who are subjects of a foreign bishop to make journeys into foreign lands to get nearer to the Heart of Jesus, or to learn at the shrine of Marguerite Marie Alacoque more of the doctrine of His heart. But if this week's Gospel is more to us than dreams and sickly visions, then we shall expect Him to meet us in our city, in our Nain, in our London; we shall look for the presence and the self-discovery of the Heart of Jesus in the common compassion and respect and goodness of the hearts of ordinary men and women, the "much people of the city." What a sermon lies in the simple fact that the Spirit Who is the source of languages and their consecrator has inspired us to give the very same name to the totality of the human race and to that noble manifestation of common compassion which drew out much people of the city to follow with the widowed mother the corpse of her only son. We call each of them "Humanity." Humanity is the name of the entirety of that flesh which the Son of God sums up in Himself. Humanity is the name of that grace of God's Spirit which moved so many men and women to follow, which moved the Son of Man to meet, the funeral at Nain.

III.

The text, however, reminds us that He Who comes to meet the funerals of our kind, and unites His compassion with our compassion, is more even

than the Son of Man, the Head of our race. "And when *the Lord* saw her," says the evangelist, "He had compassion on her." Our second Adam is not merely a better repetition of our first Adam. He is not merely the new perfect man substituted for the old imperfect man; but, as the master of this evangelist tells us, "the Man is the Lord from heaven." St. Paul says this, as many of you will remember, in the midst of that glowing and triumphant passage upon the resurrection from the dead which the English Church reads at every funeral. The Son of Man, who wept before the grave of His own friend, is also "the Lord." He is the Ruler of all: without His permission death cannot send forth one single arrow. He is the Word of the Father: without this word not one sparrow falls dead to the ground. Before God was manifested to us in the Son of Man, pious men and women were often able to say, as they looked upon the bodies of their dead, "It is the Lord, let Him do what seems good to Him." But how hard it must have been to them (how hard it even is to us!) to believe that what *seems* good to the Lord *is* good! We shall not see its goodness, we cannot see it, unless we embrace the Gospel as the Evangelist and the Church preach it to us this day. Nothing but belief of the Gospel of God in Christ Jesus, as we hear it re-proclaimed to-day in the proclamation of the compassion and the lordship of the Son of Man, can keep our imagination and our conscience from creating two gods and two lords.

We shall think there is one lord who robs us of our beloved; we shall try to think there is another lord who has compassion on us in our loss. We shall form one god who slays men; we shall hope there is another god who may perhaps be able to say to the dead, "Arise!" But the Father sends the evangelists of His Son to mankind with glad tidings of great joy. The Gospel tells us that the Son of Man Who has compassion with us, and Who is the source of our universal Humanity and of each man's compassion, is the Lord who "killeth and maketh alive." The awful Word of God which laid low the life of the young man and all those hopes which a mother had centred in his life was no other than the tender Son of Man who had compassion upon her. The Man Christ Jesus who met her at the gate was the Lord of all places and spirits; as the Lord of the young man's spirit, He brought him back out of the invisible to this visible part of His kingdom. The Lord who permits us to be troubled—or, if you will, the Lord who troubles us—has compassion with us in our troubles. He sends us the compassion and tenderness of our neighbours as the sign and herald of the greater compassion with which His Heart is drawing near us.

The Church may boldly say, then (she does say it to millions this day by reading this story as a Holy Gospel) the Son of Man, Who is the Lord, has compassion with Humanity in human troubles. Mark, I do not say the Lord has compassion with all good

and pious persons in all their troubles. This would be to empty the Gospel of all that makes it a gospel. We have no reason for thinking that this widow and her son were models of piety and goodness. A legend would have magnified them into prodigies: they may have been models of virtue; but, if they were so, the Holy Spirit Who shews us the things of Jesus is careful to hide the fact from us, lest we should make their goodness, and not the loving-kindness of God in Jesus Christ, the centre of the Gospel. The widow was a widow; the woman was a woman. That alone, probably, called out the respectful and compassionate crowd to follow her son's funeral. That certainly called the Head and Redeemer of our race to meet the funeral. Therefore we may take heart; whatsoever we are not, we are human: we may really believe the Gospel. We may each one say in the depth of private troubles, "The Son of Man, Who is the Lord, has compassion upon me." The Holy Gospel cannot become a gospel, that is a proclamation of gladdening news sent by God to us concerning our relation to Him, until we have found that this is what it announces.

XXII.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH IS TO BE KEPT, NOT TO BE MADE.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, OCTOBER 4TH, 1868.

EPHESIANS iv. 3.

"Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit."

THE apostle plainly regarded God and not the Church to be the factor of the unity of the Church. It was a part of the catholic and apostolic faith, the "one faith," as he calls it in our hearing to-day, that the Church already is "one body," and has unity. He had no conception that she had yet to be re-made one body, and would have to seek "reunion." He looked upon the unity of the Church as He looked upon the unity of the ever-blessed Trinity. Each to him was a subsisting reality to be apprehended and realized by faith. As he said, "I believe in God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," so he said, "I believe in one holy catholic Church."

I.

In the gift of His Son to be a new "Adam" or universal father, and in the pouring out of His Spirit upon "all flesh," God the Father has bestowed unity on the Humankind. In the sight of the Father we *are* one family in Jesus Christ. It is the carnal imagination of the old man in our race, and in every member of it, that we are not one. The old Adam in us judges by sense and sight, and not by faith. Because it sees families at quarrel, nations split into parties, the Church filled with churches excommunicating each other, it concludes that there is not as yet a divine unity in every family, in every nation, in the whole Church. The "endeavour," therefore, of the carnal man in us is not "to keep" the already constituted unity of the family or nation or Church—which is kept in each case, as the apostle here teaches, by lowliness, by meekness, by long-suffering, and by forbearance of one another*—but to *make* the family, the nation, or the Church into a unity by some method or methods of its own devising. The Spirit of God teaches us that we ought to be at one: we try to create a unity for mankind, or for as large a part of it as possible, by breaking down the divine and sacred partitions which God Himself has set up within His universal fold. In our Father's earthly order, as in His heavenly, there are "many man-

* *ver.* 2.

sions;" but all these, being many, are yet one, for they are parts of the one home. The great empires endeavoured to make mankind one by destroying God's distinction of nations. The Papacy has endeavoured to make the Church one by obliterating His distinction of national churches. The Socialists, the latest endeavourers to make a human unity, propose to realize an undivided humanity by breaking down the distinctions of the family and of property, and sometimes also of the nation.

The Father of "the whole family," * Who has made mankind one in His Son—and Who regards unity as a condition already constituted and given us by Him, and not as a condition to be made for Him by our wit and work—has always confounded all these attempts to build a new Babel. He broke up the false unity of the Roman empire by bringing upon the stage of human history His unsuspected reserve of the barbarian millions, the fathers of the modern nations. He ended the hollow unity of the Papal system by the Reformation. He shews the Socialist dream to be impossible, by the power of the family instinct in the heart of parent and child, and by the honourable struggle to excel which beats in the bosom of every diligent tradesman and professional man.

Cæsarism, Ultramontanism, and Socialism, are nearer of kin than their disciples take them to be. Each is an implicit contradiction of the catholic faith. Each is a virtual insinuation that God has

* iii. 15.

not already constituted us one body, that He has not already given us one Head, that He has not already communicated to us one Spirit. His apostle speaks of the unity of the Spirit as already in our possession: it is a union which we are to "endeavour to *keep*," and not to endeavour to get or to make. Emperors, popes, princes, general councils, convocations, prayers, compromises, mutual explanations of dogma, conferences of doctors and scholars, acts of intercommunion, cannot make the Church again one. They cannot give "reunion" to the body of Christ. "There *is* one body:" we *are* in that one body. There is "one Spirit:" we *have* that one Spirit. In the sight of God the mystical body of His Son can never have ceased to be one. God sees all things as they really are; therefore the Church must be as really one in the nineteenth century, as she was one when she was torn by the internal schisms of Petrites, Paulites, Apollosites, and self-called Christians, in the first century. The universal apostle called on the baptized Corinthians of the first century to repent of their boasted Petrism, Paulism, Apollosism, and Christism, not that they might *become* one body, but because they *were* already by the "one baptism" the "one body" of the "one Lord," were all alike inhabited by the "one Spirit," and were all alike called to the "one hope of their calling" by the "one God and Father of all." Saint Paul would not grant that they had no unity.

The want of the Church which the apostle discerned in his day is the want also of the Church in our day. It is not unity, for we already have unity in the one Father, the one Son, and the one Holy Ghost; in the one baptism, in the one calling, in the one faith. No; it is faith in this unity; it is belief that we really have it; it is the keeping of unity. The means of keeping unity, he tells us, are lowliness, meekness, long-suffering, and forbearing one another in love. When all the receivers of the one baptism thus "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called,"* they will discover that they *are* "one body," and that they have not to be formed into one; they will see that they have one Lord, and that they have not to elect one; they will shew that they have in them one Spirit, and that they have not to wait or labour in order to obtain one.

II.

The utterly anti-apostolical means, on the other hand, by which Christians have been continually "endeavouring to" *make* "the unity of the Spirit," are recorded in sufficient plainness in the history of the eighteen Christian centuries. To make this unity, Christians have exchanged "lowliness" for pride, "meekness" for self-assertion, "long-suffering" for intolerance, and "forbearing one another in love" for persecuting one another in hatred. The

* *ver.* 1.

fathers of the Council of Constanz endeavouring with a truly noble zeal to make the Church one, not realizing the catholic faith that she is one, murdered the holy John Huss, whom they supposed to be dividing the Church by giving the sacramental blood of the Saviour to the laity. Nicholas de Clemangis, a peacemaker of the apostolic pattern, wrote to Nicholas de Baya: "The majority of our people who go to this Council, go not so much to seek peace for the Church as to seek benefices for themselves,—they depart with huge rolls of petitions and commendatory letters: the bishops go with a view to maintain their rights of collation and patronage: nearly all go to the Council to seek their own, but very few to promote peace and the cause of Christ. Who can hope," he asked, using our text, "that the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace can ever be restored amidst so much ambition, so much flattery, so much party zeal, so much fawning homage to popes for the sake of gain?"* The Council of Trent endeavouring in honesty to make the Church one, having lost grasp of the catholic and apostolic faith that she is one, tried to recover the unity of the Spirit by wholesale cursing and excommunication of every nation and every Chris-

* Ep. cii. Clemangis, as chanter of Bayeux in Normandy, was a subject of the English king, Henry V. The last sign of any conciliar belief in a divine existing order in Humanity, anterior to the Church, appeared in this Council in its decision that the vote should be by Nations and not by persons. The English contended for their right to constitute "a Nation" in the Catholic Council.

tian inspired by the Spirit of liberty and order to refuse subjection to the Roman bishop. The rulers of the Church of France endeavoured to make the unity of the Spirit within her own borders,—first, by massacre, by legalized robbery, and by sending men to the galleys; lastly, by banishing out of the nation every baptized Frenchman who had violated the unity of the national Church by joining the Protestants. The most eloquent of living prelates of the Church of France calls it "the majestic unity of the seventeenth century." * What a hollow majesty it possessed was shewn by its fall, with other such majesties, in the next century. The rulers of the Church of England endeavoured to make a unity of the Spirit in her borders, by assenting to the imprisonment of the Jesuit missioners and the Puritan preachers and congregations who violated the national or ecclesiastical unity. The "endeavouring" in each case failed. The Church, in each case, lost not only the free service and the spiritual insight of the baptized children whom she allowed to be imprisoned, murdered, or exiled; she lost also their children and children's children.

Our inability to grasp the apostolic and catholic faith that there is one body and one Spirit, that we are called in one hope of our calling,—that we have one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, Who is above all, and through all, and

* "La majestueuse unité du XVII^e^ siècle."—*Lettre sur le futur Concile Œcuménique.* Addressed by the Bishop of Orleans to the clergy of his diocese. 6ième édition, 1868, p. 31.

in us all,—is a deadly inheritance from our fathers. The sour grapes which the fathers ate, as the Jews complained in the captivity, have set on edge the teeth of their children.* But the children will not be punished, as we hear the prophet declare in the lesson, unless they repeat the sin of the fathers. What were the sour grapes eaten by our fathers? Pride in their own ecclesiastical position; self-assertion of their own ecclesiastical theories; intolerance of any other ecclesiastical theories or positions; persecution of all who would not accept their own ecclesiastical decrees; the endeavour to manufacture a unity of the Spirit by casting into prison, or by depriving of political and social rights, or even by murdering, the men who would not accept that manufacture as the handiwork of God. Let us eat the sweet grapes provided already in "the true vine," Jesus, and in the vineyard of God, and offered us to-day by apostolic hands, and our teeth will not be set on edge. What are these grapes? The Apostle tells us: "All lowliness, and meekness, long-suffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

The unity which the Father has bestowed upon the Church, and which every church-member is told to "keep" by being himself humble, meek, long-suffering, and forbearing, is the "unity of *the Spirit*." For the uniting Spirit is ever bearing an infallible witness which we are guiltily ignoring, to which we will not attend, that all who have received the "one baptism"

* 1st Lesson for Matins.

are really "one body." What is this witness? The appearance of the splendid fruits of the Spirit in those contending Christians who tell one another that they are not members of the one body of Christ, who excommunicate one another, each of whom is angered because the Church or the State tolerates the other. I shall choose the most signal of examples. Could there be two christened men more unlike one another than Martin Luther and Ignatius Loyola?* I believe that no other man has been the cause of so much good to Christendom as Luther, and that probably no other has been the cause of so much evil as Loyola. But I can see how much evil there was in the German prophet of freedom and light, and how much good there was in the Spanish prophet of blind obedience. If we could canvass the whole body of the baptized, half of them would excommunicate Luther and canonize Loyola; the other half would excommunicate the father of Jesuitism and canonize the father of the German Reformation. Must not every one who really holds the catholic and apostolic faith that there is "one baptism," gladly discern in each of these dissimilar members of the one body undoubted signs of the presence of the one Spirit? Any one who can condemn the one to hell, while he exalts the other to paradise, is showing that he does not himself firmly grasp the catholic faith.

* In the common dislike of Luther and Loyola to Erasmus, and in the warnings against him which both these men addressed to their disciples, we have a glimpse of a certain hidden affinity of which no notice has as yet been taken.

III.

We could not possibly discover a fuller illustration of the real subsisting unity of the Church, of the sin by which the sense and blessing of her unity is lost, and of the way by which every Christian is to endeavour to keep it, than we have in that parable of the Kingdom of Heaven which the "one Lord" gives the Church to-day as the holy Gospel. He tells us that each one of us has been invited to a wedding feast. His Father and our Father is the inviter. Our baptism—the sacrament of our union to Him and to all the Church in paradise and on earth—was our invitation. The wedding is the union of the Godhead and Manhood in Jesus Christ, the perfected and finished reconciliation and mediation of God and Mankind by His Son's incarnation. To the feast of this wedding we are called. By the "one hope of our calling" every one of us has a share in all its common blessings. What is a feast? It is both a sign and a means of fellowship, of unity, and of common enjoyment. Let a man go to a feast—like the pharisees whose conduct Jesus was marking when He spoke this parable—puffed up with self-assertion, inflated with religious pride, with pride of blood and birth, with pride of intellect or pride of place; let him go into this centre of fellowship and unity without one spark of lowliness, meekness, tolerance, or charity. The feast will

be a *feast* still. It will be what the inviter has made it. But it will be no feast *to that man.* He will find nothing festive and social in it. He will regard half the guests as too far beneath him to be his fellows; his jealousy will be alert because his equals are placed above him; his envy will burn him because he cannot sit by the side of his superiors; his self-conceit will be irritating him because he has to rub his shoulder against his inferiors. In the midst of a joyous and united fellowship, such a man will be no fellow, and will find no fellow. He may eat and drink; but the feast will seem no feast to him. He will go away moody, humiliated, and dyspeptic. He will be at the feast, but he will not "*keep* the feast."

It is the same, my brethren, with the unity of the Church. God our Father, when He called us by the "one baptism," invited us to a festal social unity and fellowship. The Church has unity because God has made it one: the unity of the Church is not a condition to be made, or re-made, in some indefinite future, by some wonderful exercise of human wisdom and virtue. It is not the apostolic and catholic faith that the Church *can* be one, nor that the Church *will* be one, but that the Church *is* one. We have not to recover the oneness of Christ's universal body, but the faith in its oneness. We have not primarily to confess and repent of our schismatic condition, but of our unbelief of the catholic faith that the Church is one. It is this unbelief which has brought us into that condition. Every schism begins in the schismatic's

suspicion that those fellow-citizens from whom he departs are no longer his brethren, are no longer "the Church." On this ground the English Papists separated from their fellow-christians and fellow-citizens in the sixteenth century; on this ground the Presbyterians separated from their fellow-christians and fellow-citizens in the seventeenth century; on this ground the Independents separated from the older Puritans; on this ground the Quakers separated from all existing Christian societies. None of them said to the historical Church, "You are a sickly and imperfect Church; we will stay and labour for the health and wholeness of the one body of which God has made us and you members." The first members of every sect have said to the actual Church, "You are not a Church at all; we will not have fellowship with you." As the most real of feasts is not realized to be a feast by the guest who sits down at it without a festive heart and mind—that is, without lowliness, meekness, tolerance, and charity—so the most real of all facts, the unbroken and irrefragable unity of the Church, is not to be realized by the baptized man or whole baptized society until there is the resolute endeavour by lowliness, meekness, tolerance, and charity to apprehend and use that unity.

A family in which father, mother, brothers, and sisters are all at war is as really a family, it has as truly a divine unity by the constitution of God, as a family all whose members are dwelling in

peace and amity. The members of a family can break the conscious *communion* of the family: they cannot destroy its unity. Its communion is always conditioned by the evil or the good of their own wills; but its unity rests upon the unconditioned will of God, which has called one of them to be a father, another" to be a mother, a third a brother, a fourth a sister, and has made them all to be "members one of another in one family unity.* What would be the counsel of the apostle to the quarrelling members of a family? Would it not be exactly the same as he gives to the ecclesiastical family? "Walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called." Be a fatherly father; be a mother-like mother; fulfil that idea of a brother or of a sister which you confess to be righteous and obligatory by accusing your brethren and sisters of falling short of it. How is this to be done? With all lowliness, and meekness, and long-suffering, and forbearance of one another in charity; by regarding the unity of the family as a reality which is already possessed, not as a possibility which has to be made; by "endeavouring to *keep* the unity" of the family.

IV.

The apostle's doctrine of unity, like everything else that he utters, is full of hope. The work of keeping the unity which the Church has in that one

* iv. 25.

Spirit who is given to every one of her members is not reserved for princes, scholars, great theologians, bishops, or councils: it is shared by the humblest receiver of the "one baptism." Of this the great Chancellor Gerson had a glimpse when he said that if emperors and popes refused to call the desired general council for the healing of the Church, its convocation would devolve on other bishops or other princes, or on the citizens of the towns and the peasants, or even on the poorest old woman.* If this unity of His Church really exists, God will shew us that it exists, He will force us to see it and acknowledge it. The controversies of scholars, and the *Eirenica* which they put forth, belong to the mere surface of the Church's life. They are no perfect gauge of the advance of her members to the discovery of the truth that they have always been one, and that they are "one body" in Christ. The "one Lord," as ruler and orderer of the Nations, is forwarding the recovery of faith in the Church's unity by a number of events and influences which to our limited vision seem to have no specific relation to His Church—by the acts and decrees of congresses and parliaments by which He is universally destroying the unjust withholding of political or social equality from men for religious or

* "Sicut Ecclesia Universalis potest salvari in minima vetula, sic ad salvationem Ecclesiæ Universalis potest convocatio Concilii fieri per minimam vetulam."—*De modis pacificandi, reformandi ac uniendi Ecclesiam*, p. 119.

ecclesiastical reasons; by the judgments with which He has visited the dynasties which have lent their authority to force the Christian peoples into that unity which is made by submission to the false father on earth. This very week we have seen the Prince of the kings of the earth cast down one of these dynasties. Three centuries ago the ancestor of Queen Isabella sent the Spanish Armada to our shores. The false father of Christendom gave this intended pillage his benediction: as pretended owner of England, in his daring caricature of the authority of the real ascended King of the Nations, he debated upon whom he should bestow our land and the souls in it. Do you recollect, my brethren, why the Spanish armies were to overrun our country? It was that they might make our fathers one body in Christ, might endeavour to set up here what they mistook for the unity of the Spirit. War against our English forefathers was preached from Spanish pulpits as a Christian duty, and the forefathers of the Spaniards enlisted in the attack on England as a crusade. The "papal zouaves" of that age out of all countries rushed together to that strange militant ark of salvation, the Spanish pirate-fleet. And how did they expect to make Englishmen one body in Jesus Christ? In a catholic and apostolic way? By lowliness, by meekness, by tolerance, by forbearing charity? No: by burning alive English bishops and priests, by plundering English homes, by violating English women, by exciting English citizens to rebel against

the Nation and queen:* by substituting for the Divine authority of "the powers that be" the destructive and ruinous usurpation which has dragged down into the dust their once great people—the authority of Jesuit confessors, of inquisitors, of the stake and rack, and of the pretended father of the Church. The pope's crusaders did not themselves possess "the unity of the Spirit" which they were to bring to us. There was so much quarrelling in the army which was to restore to England "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," that the admiral Medina Sidonia had difficulty to keep the crusaders from breaking one another's heads on the quays. The ghastly dream that unity can be manufactured by mere force is probably not yet absent from the Ultramontanist mind. In our time, indeed, the ecclesiastical Cæsar can no longer persuade the rulers of the Nations to help him with sword and cannon, prison and stake: he is obliged to content himself with trying to frighten timid consciences with blustering words. In the Encyclical of the 8th of December, 1854, in which the Roman bishop defined the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary as a necessary article of the "one faith," he declared "the unity of the Spirit" to consist in docile agreement with Papal and Jesuit opinions. "Wherefore, if any persons (which God forbid) shall presume to

* Allen, who had been named Archbishop of Canterbury by the Pope, wrote and printed in Flanders a pastoral, in which he exhorted the faithful in England to rise in arms and welcome the armed apostles of the unity of the Church. (Froude, xii. p. 383. See his letter.)

think in their hearts otherwise than we have now defined, let them know that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have suffered shipwreck of the faith, and have fallen away from the unity of the Church."

The true Head and Uniter of the Church is not only bringing home to men and nations by great public acts the truth that we all are one body in Him, and that we cannot make one body for Him; but He is as truly carrying on this work in the hidden life of the family and the conscience. St. Paul, you will recollect, always connects the very lowest things with the very highest—the slave with God, earth with heaven, the action of the hour and passion of the moment with eternity. The same great principle which the apostle in the beginning of his epistle applies to the unity of the catholic Church, and next applies to the unity of the Church of Ephesus, he applies in its close to the unity of every family in the Ephesian Church. He brings down his magnificent theology to the common use of every parent, every child, husband, wife, master, servant, in the Ephesian Church. He implies that such a unity already belongs to every Ephesian as a family-man, whether he is or is not yet a churchman. In the apostolical view (as I was shewing you last Sunday) it is impossible to separate the Church, the nation, and the family. If we can do nothing in the ecclesiastical sphere for the recovery of the apostolic faith that the whole body of the baptized *is* one body

in Christ, we may do something in the national sphere by giving our sympathy and help to all that is national, liberal, and generous; by setting ourselves against whatever is narrow, intolerant, and restrictive. If we can do nothing in the nation, we can at least do something in the family. "The unity of the Spirit" is "the bond of" all "peace"—of the peace of the home as well as of the peace of the universe. We can endeavour to keep this unity in our contact with our brethren by studying to exercise "all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in charity." St. Paul bids the Church to carry the principle into the ordinary business of society and trade: "Wherefore, putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour." For what reason? "For we are members one of another."

XXIII.

THE JUDGMENT OF PARTIES; FEAR TO ASK QUESTIONS OF THE TRUTH.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, OCTOBER 12, 1873.

St. MATTHEW xxii. 46.

"*Neither durst any man from that day forth ask Him any more questions.*"

THE evangelist plainly regarded this day as a day of crisis in the self-revelation of the Lord. We shall understand the text better, I think, if we read its statement in connection with the statement which immediately follows it: "Neither durst any man from that day forth ask Him any more questions. Then spake Jesus to the multitude and to His disciples." A crisis is a judgment. This day of questions was the terrible judgment-day against the three classes of opponents—the Herodians, the Sadducees, and the Pharisees—who had each in turn come forward to the crafty assault of the eternal and incarnate Truth. The Truth on this day shewed Himself to be the Judge of men: judging all the men around Him, He rehearsed His final judgment of all mankind.

The judgments of the Truth are sure to be a marvellous satire on the judgments of the world. He set the courtly politicians, the keen intellectualists, and the self-satisfied religionists as the goats on His left hand: He set on His right hand the common despised mass of His fellow-countrymen—"the multitude," and "His disciples"—the poor and humble believers. His foes were driven from Him, silenced and confounded. Confessing to themselves that it was utterly impossible to "entrap Him in His talk," they went in search of those coarser and more brutal weapons which are usually the final arguments of the haters of the Truth.

I.

Each of the parties had in turn come forward, as we read in the earlier part of this chapter, with a *question*. The Herodians, prompted by the Pharisees, had asked their political question about the lawfulness of an orthodox Jew paying tribute to the pagan Cæsar; the Sadducees had come with their speculative questions about the resurrection; the Pharisees had come with their casuistical question about the greatest commandment in the Law. Questioning is the noblest and most legitimate way of approaching the Truth. The Jews of the synagogue of Berea, says St. Luke, "were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the

Scriptures daily whether these things were so. Therefore many of them believed." Truth cannot be known or cannot be held fast unless it is questioned: if we personify truth, we may say that it loves to be questioned. When Jesus says that He is the Truth, He invites all men to question Him. All questions put to Him, Who is the Truth of God, are in their measure so many prayers, acts of faith, and acts of worship — prayers for His light and guidance, acts of faith in Him as a faithful answerer, acts of worship directed towards Him as the very source of light to men. Every believer dares to be a questioner: when belief is growing most complete, questions multiply most quickly. This is brought out by St. John in his record of the questions which the apostles one after another put to the Truth on Maunday-Thursday night at the Eucharistic table. When every spark of belief has died out, then questioning ceases. The cowardly unbeliever, who wears a gloss and veneer of seeming belief, dares not "ask any more questions." He is afraid that he may get some answer which he does not want: he is afraid that the truth may be something contrary to that which he wishes to think true. We see this in the statement of the text, "Neither durst any man"—that is, any man who had finally rejected Jesus as the Truth of God — "from that day forth ask Him any more questions." Those, on the contrary, who believed in Him "from that day forth" asked Him even

greater and more daring questions than ever, as St. John shews us in the questions of St. Peter, St. Philip, St. Jude, and St. Thomas.

The distinct marking of "this day" by the evangelist must be intentional. Our blessed Lord on this day sat in judgment upon all His questioners. Up to this day He had not discouraged any men from asking Him questions: He had encouraged all sorts of men to question Him. On this day He gave judgment, by the character of His answers, that certain sorts of men should question Him no more. Judgment is separation and distinction: Jesus on this day separated and distinguished the questioners of Truth into their two proper classes, and divided them from one another. Judgment is manifestation: Jesus manifested and brought to light that eternal and inward division and separation which was already sundering them from one another. Judgment is a punishment to the condemned. The sects were deprived even of the reputation and power which they valued most; but they lost also the meaning of their national traditions and history. The Law and the Prophets were sealed books to them while they were reading them and arguing from their text. The Lord has left us the record of His judgment that we may perceive what His present judgments are. His judgment, like every just judgment, was twofold: it was at once judgment for men and a judgment against men. While the Son of Man gave a judgment *against*

some men, while He drove the political and religious parties from His presence, He gave at the same time a judgment for *Mankind*. He turned toward the great "multitude" of the nation, and toward the "disciples," and continued "from that day forth" to bless the People and the Church with His doctrine.

II.

What, then, is the substance of that judgment of Jesus Christ which is implied, although it is not stated, in the text? It is that the Truth, which is but a name for Jesus Christ, will cease to reply to our questions, or to satisfy us by solving them, when we cease to question truthfully. Each of the three classes of crafty assailants had cross-examined rather than questioned the Truth: it was their intention to convict, and not to learn. They were finally given over to cowardly and criminal fear of the Truth, and to the terrible judgment of ceasing to be questioners, because they had invariably approached the truth in a temper of inward untruthfulness. They did not want, like the disciples, to know what was true in order that they might act upon it. They did not want, like the honest inquirers, to know what Jesus Christ taught as true in order that they might compare His teaching with the Law and the Prophets. They did not even want, like the merely curious, to know what Jesus taught in order that they might feed their intellect or inquisitiveness. They questioned Him only,

says the evangelist, "that they might entangle Him in His talk." They were untrue within, as the Lord had already told them, and the wickedness of their questioning lay in the fact that they relied upon the sincere truthfulness of Jesus Christ for the success of their plan for His destruction. Neither Herodians, Sadducees, nor Pharisees believed Jesus Christ to be "the Truth." A man may not yet believe this, and yet he may be inwardly obedient to Christ as the Light of men by being truthful, and by fighting against all temptations to rely upon lies, or upon half the truth. But, although they did not know Jesus to be the Truth, they all knew Jesus to be perfectly and wonderfully truthful; they knew that He was full of truth; they knew that no lie was in Him; they knew at the very least that He would say exactly what He believed. They told the most damning truth when they said, "Rabbi, we know Thou art true." Their terrible abuse of that amount of knowledge and certainty which they already possessed brought down the judgment of the Lord upon them. It was because they would not be faithful in the little thing that they became unfaithful in the great thing. Their outward denial and crucifixion of the Word of God in the flesh was the final result and completion of their earlier inward denials of the same Word of God when He was speaking to their consciences.

Whatever may be our differing thoughts and opinions about the truth, although one man may

hold that to be an idol and a nothing which another man holds to be the proper object of human worship, yet each man is conscious of a certain inward unity which is imparted to us by a common Light of all men. However widely we differ in our opinion as to what is or is not true, we are at one in the consciousness that we are inwardly called upon to *be* true. We agree that we are bound as men to fight against lying, hypocrisy, deceit, and simulation, as enemies of our souls. It is the business of Christ's clergy to declare that the call to inward truthfulness, the call to be ourselves true, is nothing less than the voice of Jesus Christ our Lord within us. When we men hear this call, we are hearing the voice of the Son of Man, Whom we shall one day see, and by Whom we shall be judged.

A man must regard this inward Light, must listen to this inward Word, must obey this unseen Lord —he must himself become by obedience thoroughly true within—before he can really love Truth, and care to know it and keep it. "Every one that is of the Truth," says Jesus Christ, "heareth My voice." Unless we are ourselves thoroughly true within, we cannot possibly want to know what is true for Truth's sake. At the best, we can only desire to get more proof, or rather more probability, that whatever we at present like to call "the truth" is actually true. We may indeed think that we want to know the Truth when we are merely inquisitive, through our education or our temperament, concern-

ing facts. Christ and His apostles speak constantly of "obeying the Truth," "walking according to the Truth," "walking in the Truth," "abiding in the Truth." Thus, while the thoroughly true man is always worshipping the Truth by asking questions, the merely half-true man always thinks that he serves the Truth by hunting for arguments, or collecting regiments of witnesses, or even by securing votes for what he thinks to be the true side. The true man regards the Truth as an absolute judge—which Jesus Christ declares Himself to be. The half-true man looks upon "the Truth" as a plaintiff or a defendant, sometimes one and sometimes the other, whose cause he is bound to make seem good, although he does not thoroughly inquire whether it be good or not. As no day can come to a man, so long as he is inwardly truthful, in which he dares not ask any more questions; so whenever a man becomes consciously untrue, his untruth must at last be manifested judicially in a cowardly terror of asking any more questions. "The Truth" will come in the end to mean for such a man, not a living God to Whom men may go in confidence with childlike and disciple-like questioning; but "The Truth" will mean a dead thing, a budget of opinions, a parcel of documents, inherited prejudices, popular and passing hearsays, or the most recent edicts of a party.

Many a man is only half true, and is consequently afraid of putting any more questions to the Truth, because he dreams that there is some greater good

than truth. This supposed greater good is often (as it was with some of the Jewish leaders) unity; or it is the mere dead and thoughtless agglomeration and multitudinousness which is taken to be unity. Jesus Christ was not only threatening the dominion of Pharisees, the dominion of Sadducees, and the dominion of Herodians alike, but He was also fast dividing the Nation which each sect wished to have as its own dominion into two startling and distinct classes—believers in Him and unbelievers in Him. If, however, the Lord of men's consciences did on "that day," as man's Judge, make an outward division amongst men, He had first as the Truth and the Light plainly revealed the division which was already existing inwardly. By His judgment He finally tore off the superficial veil which had so long been hiding the profound division which already separated the Israelite in name from the Israelite indeed.

Jesus Christ is the great divider because He is the only uniter. He cannot gather together in one all the children of God who are scattered abroad, until He has smitten in pieces all the hollow organizations for gathering men together which have any other and less magnetic centre than the union existing between God and all mankind and between man and man in His own Person. "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me." If we lift up any other person or persons than Jesus Christ, any other centre of unity than the Man and the Truth, we invite Him to fight against us. He is pledged to

God and to humanity, by His Godhead and manhood, to strike down and dash in pieces all the successive idols—the lies or the half-truths—which we lift up in the stead of Him Who is both the Lord of every creature and the Truth which every creature needs to know, Who gives freedom to each and unity to all. We are continually tempted, even through those whom we respect, to be untrue or half true to Jesus Christ—to suppress what we believe to be true, or to refuse to question what we are told is true—lest we should break some idolized unity, the unity of a sect or the unity of a political or religious party. Every unity must in time perish which does not stand on that everlasting and universal "foundation which is laid." The basis of friendship between two persons, and the oneness of Humanity, alike subsist in the union and mediation of Godhead and Manhood in Jesus Christ. Have we not been called into His Church that we may teach and believe that the same Person Who is the manifestation of the truth is also the manifestation of the unity? Must not every one who finds his way toward the truth find his way also toward the unity in which God and man, the Church and Humanity, man and man, creature and creature, are at one?

The Jewish nation had found for a little time its own unity to be complete in Jesus Christ. The multitudes had manifested the national unity in the triumphant procession with which they led the Son of David into His city and their city on the pre-

ceding Sunday. They manifested it on this day in the joyful wonder with which they witnessed His muzzling of the unbelieving sects which had been hiding their true unity from them. They were to lose it again on the Friday by re-entering into the false unity of the Pontiff, and accepting his decisions and decrees against the redeeming and enlightening work of the Son of Man in their midst. The Pharisees, St. Matthew tells us in the 34th verse, were the first to prepare to meet the difficulties of the age, and to oppose the triumphant work of the world's liberator by an organized council. As the Vulgate has it, *congregati sunt in unum;* they met in unity. For they had what the religious world means by unity; they had it, because they were a sect, held uniform opinions, and wore inwardly and outwardly uniform badges. Here we see the imposing false unity: the members of it make it for themselves; they exhibit it by gathering together to anathematize and resist the wonderful work which is being wrought in the nation by the Son of Man. They wish to gather others to *themselves* by force or by enticement. They are the centre of their unity. But the true unity has not to be made; it already exists in God the Trinity, and men find access to it by gathering together to the Man, Christ Jesus.

An imposing but a hollow unity is not the only idol which we set up as a rival to the Truth. There is some grandeur even in a pretended unity; but

the saddest characteristic of the Church in our age is an utterly preposterous faith in mere organization. Organization is perhaps the idol which English Churchmen are at present most tempted to substitute for the Truth, and mostly under the plea of defending or maintaining the Truth. Where there is so much faith in organization, there is usually feeble faith in the Truth; that is, in Jesus Christ. When the three parties which coveted dominion over the Jewish nation confessed that they durst not ask any more questions of the Truth, lest the Truth should confound and shame them the more, instead of falling down in confession and repentance, they gave their whole mind to the enlarging and perfecting of their organization. They amalgamated for the time the three sects into one. They took counsel how to entrap the Ruler of the world. Do you see no such amalgamations, hear no such counsels, in our time?

What strange language is used even by good men, whom I dare not call unbelievers, about that determination to extend education and a hope in life to every English child with which God has mercifully inspired our State! It is said, "The schools which are maintained by subscriptions can never compete with the schools maintained by the State." My faith is, that whatever school is best as a school must ultimately stand, and indeed ought to stand. I hear the general expression of a fear that the State schools will prove at last to be better than the subscription schools, and that the majority of children of the poor

will finally come under the State system of education. Good men say, "Religious education is at stake! We must therefore organize, and get the sort of men we want into posts of rule over the State schools." I have been asked to join the clergy of this rural deanery in taking measures to secure the return of a certain class of men at the School Board elections. I dare not do it, because I am a priest. I should feel as if I were a conspirator against Him who sent me. He is the Light and the Truth. I stand aloof out of no wish to be singular, but out of my anxiety for the religious education of the Nation, which nothing so much threatens as the substitution of organization for the Truth by the Nation's priests. What! Is the Father purposing to withdraw His Spirit from the Church and from mankind? Is Jesus Christ about to cease being the True Light which enlightens every man who comes into the world? Will the Gospel cease to be glad tidings of great joy to England and to all people? Or is it that we ourselves have little or no faith in a Father, a Saviour, or Teacher of the whole race, and of each member of it? Is it that we ourselves are not conscious of having anything to tell modern men and women, boys and girls, which we can honestly and truthfully call "glad tidings of great joy"? Is it that we ourselves are unbelievers—that we do not believe there is any real relation between God and every human creature by the Son and in the Holy Ghost?

We may, indeed, need organization: in God's

time we shall have it. But there is only one way to any organization that is worth having, and that can stand against all the storms of this world—the way through the truth. He Who is the Truth is also the organizer: the best organization at which we can work is to give ourselves to the commendation of the truth to every man's conscience, and lead men directly to Jesus Christ.

XXIV.

FAITH IN GOD MANIFESTED BY NEIGHBOURLY KINDNESS.

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, OCTOBER 11TH, 1874.

ST. MATTHEW ix. 2.

"Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee."

THE scenery and circumstances of this miracle are related with fuller detail by St. Matthew and St. Mark than by St. Luke. We learn from them that it took place inside the house at Capernaum. The house was crowded to the door with listeners and sightseers; the street was full of persons who could not get within. The most important persons of the crowd seem to have been courteously provided with seats in the best place for seeing and hearing. "There were pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by;" they had been drawn by the growing fame of Jesus from "every town of Galilee, and Judea, and Jerusalem." The Lord was both preaching and healing.* Every act of His was being watched, every word criticized.

* St. Mark ii. 2; St. Luke v. 7.

Suddenly four men, kind-hearted neighbours, in whom every one saw charity, in whom the Lord saw *faith*, brought a palsied acquaintance to the house which was the centre of the attractive word and work of Jesus. We learn from St. Mark and St, Luke by what difficulties the first movements of their faith were tested. They pushed and strove in vain at the door,—they could neither beg nor force their way through the thick crowd of eager and curious listeners; no one was willing out of pity for this sick fellow-townsman to miss the sight of one of the Lord's acts, or the hearing of any of His words. But the four believers knew towards Whom they were pressing. They were convinced that if they could once get their wretched neighbour into the presence of Jesus Christ, and call His attention to the case, their faith would be justified that He was a saviour, or rather the Saviour. They carried the bedridden paralytic to the roof of the house, and stripping off the tiles, let down the bed with the sick man lying on it into the midst of the crowded meeting, at the feet of Jesus.

We may suppose that there were many exclamations of astonishment, and even of anger and rebuke, at an interruption so bold, and apparently so coarse. As to these, however, all the evangelists are silent; these were but the surroundings of their subject, not the subject itself. The persons who in that hour thought themselves the prominent figures in that room—the dignified doctors of divinity who had come to examine the Son of God—are placed in the back-

ground by the evangelical painters of the incident. They fix our attention on three points. First, of course, they shew us the central figure of the Lord,—"Jesus." Secondly, they shew us the tired and panting group of bearers in whom faith had shewn itself to be faith by working through love; upon that faith the eyes of the Lord were resting. "Seeing their faith," Jesus left the business with which He was then occupied, and turned at once to their business. Thirdly, we are shewn the pitiful and helpless object on the couch, to whom the Lord without hesitation addressed Himself. It seems, from the silence of the evangelists, that He gave the bearers no time to put their request into words. He took their action as their prayer, their persistence as their "continuing instant in prayer." The look of the poor man was his prayer. Jesus "said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee."

I.

Was there not in these words a number of strange surprises for the watchers of various classes and characters who were standing around the Lord? Must they not have been a surprise to the kindly neighbours, to the sick man, to the spectators, to the pharisees and doctors of the law, to the disciples? Jesus must certainly have surprised the kindly *neighbours* of the paralytic. They had not asked Him by their action to forgive the sick man of his sins, but to

heal him of his paralysis. They had not thought of him as a sinner, but as a sufferer.

The words of Jesus must have been even a greater surprise to the *sufferer* himself. He probably knew less of Jesus of Nazareth than his four neighbours knew. He had not asked them to carry him to Jesus; the faith had been "their faith," not his. Jesus, however, spoke at once to the one who had asked nothing, beyond whatever vague request for pity and possible help his look may have asked. He said nothing at all to the four, who, at least by their action, had asked Him for some answer. When He spoke, He said nothing of that physical misery which all in the room could see; but ignoring it altogether He spoke of that devouring interior misery of the bedridden man, of whose existence his kind neighbours had probably no suspicion. It was to him that the most evangelical revelation was made. The Son of Man, as He looked upon his wretched plight, shewed him that He was seeing that in him which was troubling him more than his paralysis: He saw his "sins." This inward sickness may have been one cause why his outward sickness was unhealed, since the body is often ill because no one can be found to minister to the mind diseased. The sick man must have said, "This Son of Man, then, knows *me*: this Jesus sees and understands the deepest secrets of my being; the hidden passages of my life are lying unclosed before Him: He must have been, and must be, nearer and closer to me than my nearest kindred and neighbours are. He knows

what I need without my telling Him; He gives me what I want without my asking Him." Most surprising of all must have been the name by which Jesus called him—"Son, be of good cheer." The Lord declared implicitly by this title that a relation other than that of neighbour to neighbour was existing between the paralytic and Himself. The sufferer must have asked: Who, then, can He be who makes Himself my father? How am I His son? How can He have produced me, or what has He brought forth in me? (τέκνον). The sick man must have had in that moment some sight of the Father of the new and better life of mankind in the person of Jesus Christ, the Adam of a nature in Humanity and in each man which can repent and can believe. Jesus, by these words, claimed His own part in that wretched, miserable object. The gospel lies in these words: by them He now tells us than He is claiming His own part in every palsied body and soul.

There must have been also in the conduct of the Lord some surprise for the watching *crowd*. They at least perceived that Jesus did not act here as in other cases. He did not give that which had been asked, did not answer prayer, did not cure the man from the palsy; but He told the sufferer that he had already received something which neither he nor his friends had asked—the forgiveness of his sins. The surprise of the leaders of the religious world in that crowd has been recorded by the evangelists. The pharisees and doctors of the law—adepts in the treat-

ment of interesting religious cases—had never dared to make such an unconditional announcement as this to a casual sick man, at the mere sight of him. They "said within themselves, This Man is blaspheming." St. Mark and St. Luke tell us that they "began to reason, saying, Why doth this Man thus speak blasphemies? Who is this that speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God alone?" The Lord indeed had not yet directly said, "I, the Son of Man, forgive thee thy sins." He had simply declared the completed fact: "Thy sins are forgiven thee." In the opinion of the learned doctors and casuists He thus claimed an immediate knowledge of the secret mind of God to which they dared not pretend.

II.

But was there not another surprise—the surprise of the disciples who heard and saw all this, the surprise of the evangelists who wrote it? Does not their surprise perpetuate and repeat itself in the Church of Jesus Christ each time this story is heedfully read and heard?

All the evangelists are scrupulous in telling their readers that it was not the sight of the sick man's inward misery, nor the hearing of the sinner's articulated prayer, nor the sight of the man's own faith, but the sight of the faith of the four charitable neighbours who took the kingdom of heaven in that room by storm, which opened the lips of the absolving and

healing Word of God. St. Matthew and St. Mark say, "And Jesus seeing their faith"* said nothing to them, but "said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." St. Mark and St. Luke omit the consoling preface, "Be of good cheer." St. Luke substitutes "Man" for "Son." May I not say that the substitution, or perhaps the explanation, became the evangelist of the Gentiles, the scholar of the universal apostle, whose business it was to proclaim the revelation of the Son of God in man, and bear witness that the Head of the Church was not a mere second Abraham but the second Adam? It was the vocation of the third evangelist to shew the Nations that Jesus did not claim a palsied wretch as His son because he was a believer, but because he was a man.

I am not ignorant that some commentators, afraid, like the older doctors of the law, of the consequences which may ensue to their doctrines if the words of the evangelists are read as they stand, have taken pains to correct and improve them. They tell palsied men and their friends, in other ages and places, that they must take care to supplement the Gospels with the paraphrase, "Jesus, seeing their faith *and his faith*, said unto the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee." It is possible that the sick in body and soul may find it hard to see that any gospel is left for them when this paraphrase has been added to it. If our own faith is our saviour, we need no

* *τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν.*

Saviour to come forth from God. If we find, or think we find, that we have no faith, we must think that we belong to those who cannot be saved; we must take our palsy of body or soul as destiny, and bear it as we can. Has not He Who is Himself "the Gospel to every creature" forbidden us to make this hideous paraphrase of the pharisees, by taking care that not one alone but three of His evangelists shall relate this story, and relate it with this one point of agreement amidst their differences?

I do not say that this sick man had no faith. God would not send forth His apostles to call "all nations" and "every creature" to faith unless faith were already in them. Faith was in this man in the same sense that health was in this man, or is in any man who *can* be saved from his disease. The sick man's faith was buried; what faith he once consciously possessed had probably died under the pressure of his misery, under his conception that God disliked him and was shewing His sovereign vindictiveness. Christ raised up his faith from the dead. The faith which he possessed because he was a man was raised up from the dead, and the man became a believer indeed, by seeing Christ the Word of God as the Forgiver of sins, by beholding the Father of the new and wholesome nature in himself and all mankind. We are not told that he was forgiven because he believed: we cannot fail to see, if we read the Gospel as it stands, that he believed because he was forgiven.

The question of the sick man's own faith, however, is a foreign matter which has been imported into the Gospel. The evangelists have not planted it there; their readers need not trouble themselves about it. It was solely to the faith of the four neighbours that our blessed Lord subsequently called the attention of St. Matthew, who was to relate the story to the Church. "Their faith" must have been a predominant feature in the tradition of the story which St. Luke collected and wrote down. It is in their neighbourly action that Jesus now calls us by His evangelists to see an act of faith. He said nothing of their faith during the hour of the miracle and the controversy with the religious world, either in the hearing of the scribes or in the hearing of the disciples; but He now tells all nations and every creature by the Church that the conscious forgiveness of the sinner and the healing of the sick man were rewards which He gave to the faith of those who brought him as a sick man, without much thought of his being a sinner, to the Source of physical and spiritual health.

If we had been in that room, if we had seen that mighty sign, how should we have set down our report of it? Should we have written as the evangelists have written? I think not. I think that we should have been inclined to write something of this sort: "Jesus seeing" their charity, praised them for it; "seeing their faith," but knowing that a man could not be saved by the faith of others, He looked to see whether the sick man himself had any faith: seeing that he

was repenting of his sins and putting faith in his Saviour, He "said to the sick man, Thy sins are forgiven thee." But we are called by each of the three evangelists to look upon "their faith" rather than his faith—their faith but his misery. Their faith and his outward and inward misery were the two objects upon which the regard of Jesus Christ was fixed. He looked first at their faith, but afterwards at his misery. So we must say if we can attribute the notions of time to the acts which are self-revelations of the Eternal.

I cannot define in words that *faith* which Jesus Christ saw in these four men, and which He acknowledged and rewarded by giving wholeness of soul and body and spirit to another man. It was a simple, honest, straightforward confidence in Jesus Christ Himself which made them force their way through every intervening obstacle between their sick neighbour and the Healer. It was a trust in Him as full of goodness and pity. It was a belief that in Him goodness and power were inseparable. It was a conviction that it must be the *will* of such a person as Jesus shewed Himself to be by word and work to set free the wretched. The power of the Lord had been to them not a matter of faith, but of sight and hearing: the whole town and neighbourhood talked of it. These four men had looked beyond the power and might of the acts of Jesus Christ to the character of those acts. In the character of His miracles they had recognized a Saviour

of wretched men, perhaps had begun to recognize the Saviour of the Humankind. They had passed through the mere wonder and outward exceptionality of His deeds—at which the unbelieving stayed and reasoned, at which the apologists for what is called Christianity stay—to the Will which chose to do such deeds, and to do them for such persons. A Beelzebub *can* do miracles; but only a Son *will* do such miracles as are signs to the outcast and hopeless that God is their Father; only a Word of God will do such wonders as bear witness to the enslaved that God is their Liberator.

We may see from this sign of the Son of Man (as from the healing of the centurion's servant and the benediction of the children whom the mothers brought to the Lord) that the maintaining of our faith in Jesus Christ is not only a profit to ourselves. "He healed him, having seen their faith," says St. Cyril of Alexandria,—"not that of paralytic, but of the bearers; for it is possible for one to be healed by the faith of others."* Since faith cannot exist without working love, not only to the Unseen Goodness but to our seen neighbours, all who lie wounded on the road of a man of faith must in some degree gain a benefit from his faith. The fact that a man does good deeds gladly, shews that he has a faith in the Unseen Goodness, although he has not yet seen nor learned the name of the Son of Man

* St. Cyril Alex. on St. Luke, from an ancient Syriac version, edited by Dean Payne Smith, p. 81.

in Whom the Unseen Goodness is completely revealed as "Our Father." We pray for others as well as for ourselves when we say with the apostles whom Jesus sent to every creature, "Lord, increase our faith." The nearer our faith draws us to Him Who is the centre of Humanity—Whom we have heard St. Paul describe in the Second Lesson as "the firstborn of every creature," "the image of the invisible God," "by Whom all things consist," "in Whom it has pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell"*—the more we shall perceive the bond which exists between Him and every man, the more eager and persistent we shall be to bring our palsied neighbours and brethren into conscious contact with Him.

Only let us recollect that this carrying of men into the presence of Jesus Christ is not merely done by praying for them. The prayers which we offer to God for other men and women may have small likeness to that difficult carrying of the paralytic to the feet of His Son, which is set before us to-day as an example of faith. Such, it seems to me, are the impertinent and pharisaical prayers which we may read in revivalist periodicals, or may hear in those intermittent spasms of daily prayer which the religious world institutes every few years—a caricature of the calm and unintermittent daily prayer of the universal Church. We may drag persons before Jesus Christ by our prayers—as the pharisees dragged the woman taken in adultery, as the sons of Zebedee dragged

* Col. i. 21.

the Samaritan villagers, as the brother dragged the brother who would not divide the inheritance—in order that He may do our will upon those persons, and gratify our self-esteem by identifying our will with the will of God, and our opinions with the wisdom of God.* It is not impossible that some of the persons whom we drag before the Lord may be less paralytic and diseased in His sight than we are. The true carrying of men into His presence is done (as we are shewn in this Gospel) by resolute pushing and struggling against the general stream and concourse of a religious world, by being willing to endure the charge of unseasonableness and coarseness from idle or speculative bystanders and critics, by determining that the hopeless and helpless shall have us as their representatives and helpers, by demanding for them their right of contact with the Liberator of mankind, Who already knows their whole outward and inward sufferings and needs.

* I take the following specimens at hazard from one number of *The Christian*, a revivalist newspaper which some admirers have lately gratuitously supplied to every clergyman and dissenting minister. "Requests for praise and prayer,—That a dear brother and sister may be led to the meetings *at Dublin, and thereby* get savingly blessed. For Professor Tyndall. That the Romish teaching of the clergy in an important town may be exposed and brought to light, and their mischievous doctrines condemned before the world."

XXV.

THE HATRED OF OUR KINDRED AND OUR OWN SOULS DEMANDED FROM US BY JESUS CHRIST.

OCTOBER 20TH AND 27TH, 1872.

ST. LUKE xiv. 26.

"If any man come to Me, and hate not his father and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own [life] *soul also, he cannot be My disciple."*

OUR blessed Lord had just finished the parable of the excuses offered by different sorts of men for refusing the invitation which God sends them to come to fellowship with Him and with Humanity at His feast. He finished it with the assertion, almost incredible to many of His hearers, that those who will in the end come to His feast, either by invitation or by compulsion, will far exceed in number those who choose to stay away. The men of property and respectability having refused to enter into fellowship with the Giver of the feast, the servants are told to go quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and to bring into His house all the lowest and most wretched of its citizens. Then, the house not being

yet full enough to satisfy the generous love of the Lord, He sends His servants outside the city, to the highways and hedges, that they may bring the very dross and offscourings of the Humankind to sit down at His table.

I.

It seems as if the prophetic close of the Lord's parable began to be fulfilled upon the spot. When He rose up from the pharisee's table at which on that sabbath-day He had healed the dropsical man and delivered His wonderful series of feast-parables, we do not read that any of the gentlemen, scholars, and divines with whom He had dined forsook all, rose up, and followed Him. But when He was once outside the house, and outside their refined and religious class, everything was in one moment changed. There He had no longer to complain of a scarcity of disciples. "The streets and lanes of the city," the "highways and hedges," did indeed pour forth their thousands. All moved in one direction: the men went wherever the Head of Humanity went; they shewed that, at least for the time, they were choosing Him as their leader, or were drawn after Him as their attractor. "And there went great multitudes with Him: and He turned and said unto them, If any man come to Me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple."

The Lord of consciences, Who knows what is in every conscience, arrested this great excited multitude of followers. He stood still, and made them stand, while He preached to them a sermon upon deliberation, or, as He calls it, "counting the cost." * It is important to recollect what St. Luke is careful to tell us, that Jesus spoke these words "to them" —that is, to persons whom we should call "the mob." For these words have been declared by commentators to be "counsels of perfection," meant for some few rare and elect men, rather than the common duty required from every one in the Christian multitude. In this sermon to the multitude, Jesus Christ utters first of all His tremendous statement of the *cost* of following Him. He shews that it is a burden to be His disciple. Next, He makes His demand upon His followers clearer by three short parables—(1), The unprepared builder, whose uncompleted tower becomes the laughing-stock of his neighbourhood; (2) The ambitious but unprepared king, who has to choose between certain defeat or humiliating subjection; (3) The salt which has lost its savour. If we take the text alone (without these three parables which follow it), it will give us enough to think about. The text was the Lord's own text; the parables were His sermon upon it.

What is His text? There are thousands who desire to be disciples of Jesus Christ. They believe many of His promises; they deliberate a

* *ver.* 28.

little; they count the cost a little. The sum they put together is this—It is better to be saved than to be damned: heaven is preferable to hell. We make a sensible and a good bargain if we secure a life of endless happiness by a certain amount of goodness and self-denial in this short life, which may end at any instant. It is a bad and mad speculation to risk the everlasting loss of our souls by the momentary indulgence of our souls. Jesus promises everything to those who follow Him. The most shrewd, prudent, sensible, businesslike thing we can do is to go with Jesus Christ. "And there went," as the result of some deliberation, some kind of counting of the cost, "great multitudes with Him."

It is as the result of some deliberation, of some counting of the cost—if only the deliberation that it is best on the whole to go the same way as the majority and mass of good or goodish men go—that in all times, and to-day in baptized nations, great multitudes go with Jesus Christ. You and I, my brethren, by our presence in the Church, are forming the parts of such a multitude. Some deliberation—it may be a very little, it may be very incomplete—has brought even the most careless of us this night into the house of the Lord. Let us forget then, in His presence, that He once turned and spoke to a multitude of Jews. Let us be sure that whatever He once said to them, He, as the same Eternal Word, is at this moment saying to us, the English multitude of men and women who have followed Him into His House.

"He turned," says St. Luke, to speak to His followers. Those multitudes were behind Him, but each creature among them was present to His heart. He turns to us—yes, as if our generation, as if this part of our generation, as if each one here present, were the sole object of His loving care and His wisdom. Hear what He says to us, one by one: "If any man come to Me." The Judge of conscience seems to distinguish in His language between coming *to* Him and coming *after* Him.* He who goes to Jesus may take nothing with him—no more than Pilate took when he went into the judgment-hall to Him. He who goes after Jesus takes his cross. What is required of us that we may not only go to Him, but follow after Him and be His disciples? Two hard things: a certain hatred for what we love—a certain hatred for our dear kindred and our precious souls, for the best gifts God has given us; a certain love for what we hate—a love for the distressing cross which each man's sins have brought upon himself, or for the strange work which God has laid upon him. Ah! my brethren, do they not strike us as tremendous and dreadful conditions when we try to state them in our words! What do they seem when we hear Him state His conditions in His perfect words?

II.

"If any man come to Me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren,

* *ver.* 26, πρός Με; *ver.* 27, ὀπίσω Μου.

and sisters, he cannot be My disciple." Do you notice that I have left out one clause of the verse? I hope the omission has given a shock to your consciences. I have omitted it that I may re-insert it, to shew how the whole purport and meaning of the Lord's charge is gathered up into the climax of it. "Yea," and "he must hate *his own soul* also." For our Lord said "soul," and not merely "life;"* although our translators, afraid perhaps of the consequences of letting the Truth speak for Himself, have englished it as "life."* This last demand is the climax of the Saviour's demand from men.† If the Son of God had not put this clause as the climax of His demand, it is possible that not only the multitude, but even the scribes and pharisees, would have followed Him. 'Jesus,' they might say, 'teaches 'what we teach.' The claims of religion, and of the 'soul, and of God, are supereminent claims. Father, 'mother, wife, children, and everything must yield to 'the claims of the soul. Love of religion and the 'soul must outweigh the love of family. We must 'first love and care for our own souls, and then love 'and care for our family. The salvation of his own 'soul must be more important to a man than the 'honouring of his parents, the love of his wife, chil-'dren, or brethren. We have formulated this doc-'trine, and put it into a practicable and useful shape.

* τήν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν.

† ἔτι δὲ καὶ, *auch dazu sein eigen* (Luther has; but he adds) *Leben*, not *Seele*. The Vulgate has *animam*, not *vitam*.

'Moses said, "Honour thy father and thy mother;
'and whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the
'death." But "we" say, If a man shall say to his
'father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say a gift,
'by whatsoever thou mightest be benefited by me;
'he shall be free, and "we" suffer him no more to do
'aught for his father or his mother.'

Not only did Jewish scribes and pharisees use such words as these, but they have been used by thousands of scribes in Christendom, in some shape or other, again and again. The third Commandment, the fifth, and the seventh have been broken by Christian men and women in their attempt to keep the Lord's charge by omitting the pith and climax of His charge. They have taken or borne God's name in vain, they have dishonoured father and mother, they have sundered man and wife. Parents, children, brethren, again and again in the history of Christendom, have been nothing to men and women in comparison with their own souls. In the early and middle ages husbands often separated for life from their wives, and wives from their husbands, with the serious intention of loving their own souls.

We must realize, my brethren, the full weight of the deliberation to which Jesus calls us, the whole cost which He bids us count. You wish to follow Him, to be His disciple. Can you meet His conditions? Can you *hate* your dearest kindred and your own soul. I may not destroy His charge by substituting two words of my own for His one word. I may not

say here as He said on quite another occasion to a certain person, Can you *love* Him *more* than them? I may not say, Can you *love* them *less* than you love Him? Even in this case I ought to add, Can you love your own soul less than you love Him? Are you ready to care less for the selfish safety of your own soul than for the spread of the kingdom and the glory of Him who counted not His own soul dear unto Him, but for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, descended into hell? Here Jesus speaks nothing of such conditions as loving less or loving more; His condition here is hating. The deliberation to which He invites, not a few saints, but the whole multitude of His followers—not only His apostles, but the city mob—is nothing less than this: Are you ready, for the sake of the truth and of righteousness—for the sake of Him who is the Truth, and is Righteousness—to *hate* them, to hate your own soul?

Every one, boy or girl, man or woman, has such a time of deliberation, such a time of counting the cost. It is not so much indeed a time as a season. For with some this deliberation is over for ever in a moment. Thus the apostles Peter and Andrew, and the sons of Zebedee, left their fish and their trade; thus Matthew left his seat of custom. The instant they heard the voice of Jesus calling them, and recognised in Him the right Lord and Director of men, they left all, and followed Him. With others the deliberation endures days and even years: for

some time they follow Jesus and are His disciples, but some scandal arrests their steps and they turn back, and for a while "walk no more with Him." It was thus with those whom, as St. John tells us in the sixth chapter of his gospel, Jesus scandalized by His doctrine. St. Hippolytus records a tradition that St. Luke himself was originally one of those who had not deliberated on the entirety of the demands of Jesus Christ upon the conscience, heart, and reason of every human creature, who had not counted the whole cost of being His disciple. This tradition adds that he was brought back to the Lord by St. Paul's ministry.

We, my brethren, were pledged at our baptism to be disciples indeed, to follow the Lord fully. Most of us acknowledged this to be our right and willing position when, in holy confirmation, we came to receive from the Supreme Pastor the spirit of strength to establish, settle, and make us His for ever. Now baptism and confirmation are not the signs of a private club. The one does not admit us to some rare and secret society, the other does not confirm us in a private fellowship. They are the signs of the universal or catholic society. The one admits us into, the other settles us within, that one society which is implicitly co-extensive with Humanity, which is meant to contain "all Nations" and "every creature." The man is not born who ought not (in order to be perfectly a man) to be a churchman, a disciple of Jesus Christ, a follower of Jesus, a

bearer of His cross after Jesus, a hater of his own soul. Hence you see that, in this caution to all who are deliberating whether they will or will not follow Him, Jesus is not setting down the conditions for being a perfect monk or a complete nun, but the conditions for being a real and true man or woman. In the sense in which the Incarnate Wisdom uses these words, every one of us who pretends to be His disciple must hate his father, his mother, his wife, his children, his brothers, his sisters, yea, and his own soul also.

The standing and work of the man who becomes His disciple is opened in the three short parables which follow the text. Without this hatred, no one of us can build that tower which each man is pledged to build up, by his baptism, confirmation, communion, attendance at church, prayer. Without this hatred no one of us can fight that king coming against us with ten thousand, whom every man is pledged to fight, by the least measure of willing strife against inward sin or outward wrong, by his slightest desire of being good and not being wicked. Without this hatred, we are salt without savour, men without humanity or virtue. Jesus does not say that, without this hatred, no one who comes to Him can be a hermit or a canonized saint. He says that without it no one can be His disciple. We begin to build without "counting the cost;" we go to war without seeing if our army is good enough and strong enough to meet our enemy, if

we leave out of our deliberation the necessity of this hatred.

III.

What then *is* this hatred of His best gifts to us—this hatred of our dearest kinsfolk and our own precious souls—which, as we saw last Sunday,* the Son of God demands, not from some few men or women, but from every one and any one who means to go with Him; yes, from every one who determines to be a true man? The multitude was no refining company of casuists: it was like all later multitudes: it knew what Jesus meant by His words. Grotius says that the Jews used to set before their proselytes the incommodities and discomforts they would find in taking on them the noble yoke of the law. They wished the heathen candidate for circumcision to understand that he would not become an Israelite indeed without a thorough renunciation of self. Jesus tells us that His "yoke is easy," and His 'burden is light:" but here He sets before every one who wishes to be His disciple the condition of strange hatred without which it is impossible to put on His easy yoke or carry His light burden. The multitude was not more profound or penetrating than we are. If they knew what this hatred was, you and I, my brethren, know what it is, and my function is to try and shew you that you know.

Jesus says this to consciences; and the conscience

* The second part of the sermon was preached on October the 27th.

of every one of you tells you that you have heard Him say it to you. I do not know at what season He first made you hear it: I know not how clearly or how dimly the consciousness broke in upon you, that it was the proper Lord of your conscience Who was saying it. But you once said to yourself, or you sometimes say now,—I have a life to live in this world; as kinsman, workman, tradesman, clergyman, professional man, in whatever business I am set as a man, I can either live this life altogether to myself, for securing my own pleasure, or what I think will be my pleasure, or I can live it altogether to another, who makes Himself known to my conscience as my right Lord and Master and Leader. I can make my own lust the ruling law of my life, I can make my own satisfaction the incessant and persistent end of all my thinking and all my doing; or I can make a Will better than my own will my law, and I can keep before me in all I think and do an End better than the very grandest and most ambitious of my selfish ends.

Suppose, for instance, the man who hears the universal Word say to him, "Follow Me," and who wills to follow that imperative Word, is a layman, a man of business, like St. Peter or St. Matthew when they heard the Word and determined to obey. Jesus says to every one entering on the work of life, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and its Righteousness;" "Take no thought what ye shall eat, drink, put on." He reminds us that after all

these things the heathen seek—these who do not pretend to follow Him, who are not yet conscious that they ought to be disciples. God is in all things to be first; self to be second. Or, rather, God is to be both first and second. For the Son makes to all who follow Him fully the daring and royal promise which no mere teacher ever dared to make, that God will feed them, clothe them, and give them all things necessary. This is the A B C of the School of the Son of God, the first lesson of discipleship to Him. But is this the kind of thing which the *father* Zebedee had said to his sons John and James? Think what their *mother* asked as the best possible boon for them. Is this the kind of lesson which the *father* Jonas had taught to Simon and Andrew? If, however, the parents of the future apostles, in their highest recollections of the meaning of fatherhood and motherhood, taught them some stammering syllables of this lesson, do you suppose that this was the kind of thing which the ambitious and honour-craving *souls* of Simon and the sons of Zebedee were saying to them? They had many thoughts of the Kingdom of God: but that which each disciple's "own soul" desired in that Kingdom was much the same as that which the rich fool promised to his "soul"—the securing of a future ease and glory for self.

Is the Lord's charge the kind of charge which father, or mother, or kindred, or a man's own soul will echo and approve, even when the man who

hears it confesses it to be the Lord's voice? Father and mother, wife and children, because they love him, hope indeed that he will get to some kind of future Kingdom of God in another universe, when his fortune is made, or his living is earned, or his life's work here is ended. He is more or less anxious that his own soul, because he loves it, may be saved and not be lost. But father and mother have spent much money and more care upon his training: if rich, they have a business or a great name to leave him; if poor, their hope for him probably is that he will be wealthier in this world than they have been. Wife and children tell him that they must be clothed and fed. What father and mother —I confess it as a father—is not tempted to say a thousand times, "Seek first what to eat, what to drink, how to clothe yourself. Seek to get on, or at least seek to pay your way and keep out of debt. God will help those who help themselves?" How few times in comparison do they say, "Seek first the Kingdom of Heaven and its righteousness. God will help those who help Him by helping Mankind.* In teaching and working like Paul, in fishing like Peter, in sitting at the tax-office like Matthew, never

* The speech of the old peasant to Faust. When Faust counted not his own soul dear unto him, when he was a man, and not a mere doctor, he went

"in jedes Krankenhaus;
Gar manche Leiche trug man fort,
Ihr aber kamt gesund heraus.
Bestandet manche harte Proben;
Dem Helfer half der Helfer droben."

lose sight, as dominant end of all life, of the present Kingdom and the present righteousness of God. Seek never to rise by another's fall; seek no profit out of another's loss; take care that your soul does not use your brethren and their faculties of goods or of mind as mere stepping-stones upon which you mount yourself up to success."

Even if parents and kindred spoke in this way to us, they would find no native seconder of their advice within ourselves. Does your *own soul* say to you, "Seek first that the kingdom of the Father of all may come, and the righteous will of the Father of all may be done on earth"? No. It is the whole lust of our souls, descended from Adam's fallen soul, that our kingdom may come, and our will be done; that here on earth, and hereafter in heaven, our souls may get for themselves the fullest self-satisfaction. The Saviour of the soul does not startle us nearly so much when He tells us we must hate our father and mother and dear kindred, as when He comes to the climax of His charge and tells us that we must hate our own souls also. No other voice except that of the Word Who says, "Follow Me," no other voice except that which tells us that we must hate our self-seeking souls in order to hate in His sense our father and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, ever calls us to place God's end before our own ends, God's will above our own wills. If parents tell us this, then He is speaking to us through them. If our own conscience and reason set this before us as

obligatory or as the best and wisest, then He is enlightening conscience and reason. When His disciple prefers His voice to the voice of an anxious father and indulgent mother, to the unspoken voice of wife or speaking look of needy children, to the prudential voices of brothers and cautious friends—above all, to the self-seeking voice of His own soul, which gives power to all the other voices—then he can turn to his business, and find it sanctified and glorified: then he will see that the shop and office, the fishing-boat and the treasury, are not outside, but within the sacred and ever-present Kingdom of God: then he will see that every occupation in which men can trample down the lusts of their own souls is a sphere in which the Father's Kingdom can come, and His Will can be done. St. Peter and his brother, St. John and his brother, as soon as they have learned to postpone their business to the Kingdom of God, go back to their business. It was when they were again in their boats, and busy at their trade, that the Risen Saviour chose to manifest Himself alive to them as Lord and Ruler of the visible as well as the invisible world — as Master of human business and of the fishes in the lake, as well as Master of the powers of the hidden worlds of death and hell.

If we find an illustration of the Lord's meaning in the life of His disciples as tradesmen, its meaning comes out still more clearly in their life as clergymen. A father and mother design that their son shall

be a priest. They are, out of their very love, anxious for his highest good: it is their prayer that he may be a faithful teacher, a diligent pastor of Christ's flock. But it is probable that this, although it must be the dominant desire of their consciences, is by no means the desire which they set most openly and prominently before him. They wish him to "get on," to obtain some share of that patronage—that remnant of feudalism in modern society—which is now the strange and barbarous substitute for the ancient electing rights of the holy Congregation of the Lord. They wish him to be appreciated as they think (as they let him know they think) he deserves. If he has wife and children, he must think again and again what can become of them if he dies. His brothers and sisters set him the example; his friends give him the precept of struggling for advance and preferment. Love of parents, wife, children, brothers, alone may indeed not have strength enough to lower his ends; but they are seconded and helped by his love of his own soul. At the gate of ordination, or in some illness or affliction, or in an ecclesiastical crisis which shakes the Church, the Incarnate Truth says to him, "Follow Me. Count the cost of being My minister. Is it the end of your life that you may bear witness to the Truth? Or, after all, is the love of your own soul, the satiation of its lust to lay up goods or honour for itself in the future, as much your end as it was the end of the rich fool in My parable?"

It seems to me that the demand made upon us by

Jesus as the Head of the Church must apply as fully to our fathers and brethren in the Church as to our kinsmen in the flesh. Thus, when Jesus said to Saul, "Follow Me," what was the character of his compliance, the result of his deliberation? "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood"—his own soul, his kinsmen's advice, his religious directors—"neither went I up to Jerusalem to them that were apostles before me." It was so with Luther. He regarded the Bishop of Rome and the Church of Rome with passionate affection as his father and mother. He was as full as any of us can be with a selfish passion for the safety of his own soul. But when the Truth said to him, "Follow Me," he counted the cost, he hated father and mother and brother, and his own soul also, and followed Jesus, the everlasting Truth and Righteousness. And what a tower the great Master-builder enabled the poor solitary German monk to build up! What an army the Lord of hosts enabled him to gather! With what a savour he has seasoned the Christian Nations! Half the triumphs of Truth and of Justice in the modern world may in great measure be traced up to the awful moment in which Luther deliberated and counted the cost whether he would hate father, mother, brother, and his own soul, or whether he could hate the Truth, which is Jesus Christ the Lord.

What a contrast is the demand of the Head of the catholic or universal human Church to the demands of the Roman Vice-Christ and of the Sects! "If you

would be our disciple," cry the Puritan and Methodist sects, "you must love your own immortal soul above everything and everybody." God has startled them with the appearance of a new sect in their midst, whose adherents say that men have no immortal souls until they are converted, and who do not reckon the prizes taken in a revivalist raid as true converts or "Christadelphians." The Vice-Christ substitutes supreme self-seeking for the supreme self-sacrifice which the true Christ demands. The Pope's personal appeal to a late pervert to love "his own soul" more than the kingdom of God and its righteousness, seems to have been the final argument which carried him out of the Church of his Nation into the Ultramontanist sect. He has left us, alas! the baleful legacy of his sceptical and sickly hymn, "Pilgrims of the Night," so often sung in our churches.*

IV.

The love of parents, wife and children, brothers and sisters, from which the Lover of souls here calls

* "The Life and Letters of F. W. Faber, D.D., priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri." By J. E. Bowden. 1869. The late Monsignore Grant procured for him, while still an English parish priest, an interview with the Pope. "The Pope said to me," he wrote to the Rev. J. B. Morris, on St. Alban's-day, 1843, "Think of the salvation of *your own soul.*" Again, before laying his hands upon this man, who was travelling with the status and possibly the money entrusted to him by a noble and believing Nation that he might be a national priest—a witness to a divine existing order—the foe of Nations said, "You must think for yourself and for *your own soul*" (pp. 195, 196). A year later he wrote to Dr. J. H. Newman: "Do what I will, I cannot outgrow the fear of being *damned*, as out of the Church" (p. 222).

us away in order that we may be able to follow Him fully, is not that self-surrendering love of sons and daughters, of which the source and pattern exists in the love which He has eternally as The Son to The Father. It is not that self-sacrificing love of husbands and brothers, whose root and copy subsists in the love which He has shewn to His Church as her husband, and to all men as their brother, by His self-humiliation, death, and burial. It is not that busy victorious love of parents labouring for their children, whose origin and archetype is revealed in the love which He has shewn to us as Father of the world to come by His conflict with the destructive and hating forces of sin and hell, and by His inheritance of the Kingdom of Heaven for His family. Our reason, which is the creature and likeness of Himself, the uncreated Reason, tells us that that Son Who alone has ever been The Son cannot call any sons and daughters to the least degree of a positive hatred of their fathers and mothers. Nor does He call us to measure and apportion the love which we give to our kindred. Coldly to determine with ourselves that we are loving them too much is to cease to love them rightly at all. His love to them and to us and to all is the only right measure of our love to them and to all, and we cannot love any creature so much as He does, who is the Firstfruits of every creature, and gave up Himself for all.

The love which blocks up the way between us

and Jesus Christ is the love which prevents us from giving up ourselves, body, soul, and spirit, to One Who is the Head of every man. We may give it the beautiful name of love of father, of mother, of brother, or of child; but He sees it in its ugly nakedness. It is the disguised love of ourselves. It is the self-delighting outward projection of our inward self-seeking. The meaning of His words is to be sought not in the examples of sons and daughters who were themselves diseased with this love of their own souls, and who hated father and mother out of self-love, but in the climax with which He winds up and interprets His words. All hatred of father is nothing unless it has as its end and climax the hatred of our own souls. We are to hate our own souls in our hatred of father and mother. We are to hate the way of our own self-seeking in the paths of life to which their love for us tempts us—paths which are sure to be more lovely and attractive to our own souls than the one path which Jesus has marked out for the Humankind and for each disciple as man's path by His own blood. God calls us to hate their kind temptations, as he called Adam to hate the kindly meant temptation of Eve, and Job to hate the kindly meant temptation of his wife, who out of her very love and pity towards him urged him to give up following God.

The end of all deliberation, the cost to be counted, is not, Do I hate father and mother, wife and kindred, in themselves? but it is, Do I so hate

them as I hate also my own soul? Is my love for them the same selfish sort of love which I have for my own soul? St. Paul, the master of the evangelist who alone records these words of Jesus Christ, has shewn in his address to the elders of the Church of Ephesus how he himself understood them. "I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide in me. But none of these things move me, *neither count I my soul* dear unto myself*, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God." The salvation of the soul includes its saving or liberation by Jesus Christ from its selfish lust for safety.

* *τήν ψυχήν μου.*—Acts xx. 22—24.

XXVI.

THE HATRED OF THE WORLD TO THE CHURCH.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, JUNE 14, 1873.

1 JOHN iii. 13, 14.

"Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you. We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren."

"THE World" is often with us modern Christians a mere nickname with which our self-esteem labels our opponents. It is not improbably the nickname with which they also label us. Every sect, and every party within the Church, takes delight in thinking itself to be the fellowship which has "passed from death unto life;" it tries to regard all the opposition and dislike of its fellow-men to it as a kind of proof that it is this fellowship, and that its rivals and foes constitute the world. The Pope calls the divine order which the Father has established in Humanity "the world." He regards the nations as the world, because by just and equal laws they contradict his assumption and thwart the evil threatened to nations, to families, and to persons by the free working out of his principles. Protestants regard the totality of unbelievers,

of the indifferent, and of catholics as "the world." Catholics regard the totality of unbelievers, of the indifferent, and of the Protestants as "the world." Every little separatist society means by "the world" the entirety of the human race outside its own walls. None of these marvel if they are hated by the men and women whom they choose to call "the world:" they would marvel much more if they were loved by them.

I.

We cannot know what the world's hatred is, unless we first know what that world is, which, as the apostle says, hates the fellowship which has "passed from death unto life." No doubt we use the word rightly when we use it roughly as the common name for all those who stand in opposition to "the Church." But such a definition is not only insufficient, but it will be hurtful, if we virtually mean by the Church ourselves and those who agree with us. We cannot know what St. John means by "the world" so long as we make self or party the starting-point of our survey.

If we wish to understand St. John's use of the term "world," we must turn to him for his definition of it. We shall find in it a surprising contrast to our definitions. He takes his starting-point from God. He does not look at the Church on earth, nor look up and down the earth at the foes and persecutors of the Church, in order to learn what the world is. He

knows that we can see nothing as it is, until we see it in God. He looks straight through the opened door in heaven, of which we heard him speak in the Trinity-Sunday Epistle. Seeing the Trinity in Unity, he sees what the world is.

What does he discover by his vision of God the world to be? "All," he declares, "that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." It is not enough, then, to speak of "the Church and the World" as the two opposites. They are indeed opposites; but why are they opposed? Why should the world hate the Church? It must be on account of some relation between the Father and the Church; for not the Church and the world, but the Father and the world, are, according to St. John, the final opposites. "If any love the world," he says, "the love of the Father is not in him." The Church, therefore, will shew herself to be the opposite of the world, and will be hated by the world, in proportion as she bears witness to the Father, in proportion as she claims for "all nations" and for "every creature" in the earth a direct relationship to God — as she asserts each fatherland or nation to be God's family, and each man or woman to be God's son or daughter, in the Son of Man. The apostle of Jesus Christ does not merely understand by the world the totality of human creatures and human forces opposed to the Church and to God: he understands by the world the totality of those persons and forces that are

opposed to "the Father"—opposed to God as the revealer of Himself to mankind in the Son—opposed to God as the claimer of mankind by that Holy Spirit Who is compelling men to cry out to the unseen One, "Abba, Father," and Who is persuading men and women to believe, in spite of all specious appearances to the contrary without them or within them, that they are not mere particles of a world, but must be the children of God. It was St. John's business as the apostle of Jesus Christ to call men and women of all kindreds and tongues, of all opinions and religions, to believe in God as their reconciled Father in Jesus Christ. It was his vocation to proclaim to all miserable and degraded creatures on the earth that they had a right through a Son of Man Who is the Son of God—Who is binding God and mankind in one, Who is enlightening every man who comes into the world —to say to the awful One whom none can see, "*Our* Father Who art in heaven." The apostle says to those who have repented of their sins, have renounced their unfilial and unbrotherly isolation, and have come into the universal-human Church, "Truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ."

The World hates the Church because the Church, by her very constitution, bears witness to the Father. By bearing witness to a common Father she demands that men should treat each man as a brother, and not as an alien. Whenever and wherever the Church is speaking feebly and hesitatingly of the Fatherhood of God, and of the consequent brotherhood of men,

then and there the hatred of the world is proportionately modified or altogether ceases. The world then comes willingly into the Church. The world respects the endowments of the Church's clergy and increases them. The world preaches out of the Church's pulpits. The world counts upon the Church's clergy as the surest allies of its social or political unrighteousness. The world even sits on the nation's judicial benches in clerical persons; and the ordained witnesses to the common Father of all classes, who should themselves be fathers of men and women, stand forward as the advocates of one class against another, and doom miserable men and women to prison. In our own day women have been sent by priestly justices into prison, because they claimed that common human right to labour, and to make as much as possible by their labour, which every merchant, shopkeeper, or professional man has long been able to claim without fear of prison. I know that it is said, "They broke the law." But what law? The unreformed remainder of that kind of law which the fathers and champions of the gentry and of the middle classes had each in turn to break, in order to win freedom for themselves and their children. The Church's own priests, if they shew no sympathy with such law-breakers, will certainly be breaking a more awful law, and must expect a more awful judgment.*

* "Woe to England's manhood, if it submits to clerical persecution of workmen's wives and children!" was the significant sentence on a banner carried in a great procession of artisans on Whitsun Monday, 1873—the season in which the clergy were celebrating the Gift of the Liberating Spirit to all flesh.

We shall understand more clearly how it is that "the Church" and "the World" are opposites, how it is they are utterly irreconcilable, if we look at the contrary foundation upon which each is standing. The Church stands upon that world-wide or catholic relation to Himself which God has established for our whole Humanity by "taking of the Manhood into God." The Church stands upon the love of God to all sinners, which He has manifested through the sacrifice of His Son. The Church is sent in the power of the Spirit of God, to preach the glad news of the Son of God and Son of Man to every creature, and to baptize every creature into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The Church, therefore, is God's perpetual witness to the right and privilege of Humanity, and to the right and privilege of each man and woman and child. A Sect, or worldly caricature of the Church, is a witness to a supposed Father of some, to a Saviour of some, to a Spirit who is teaching some. But the Church is the witness to a Father of all, to a Saviour of all, to a Spirit who is striving to bring all into obedience and to the love of God and of one another. It is from this relation to Humanity as a whole, and from this alone, that the society of the baptized derives the name and quality of Catholic. Any lower meaning of the word Catholic than this meaning is not worth contending for by serious men in an age like ours. Men and women who call themselves "Catholics" because they have made an amalgam of some of the

floating and transient religious opinions of their age with some of the convictions of all ages and some of the opinions of earlier ages, may end in finding themselves the most protestant of Sects; just as men who call themselves "evangelical" may, if they will, hear the conscience of our age declare that it cannot find anything it can honestly call an evangel —gladdening news to all men about God—in the opinions for which they are fighting.

The World, unlike the Church, does not stand upon the common and catholic foundation which God, because He is the Father, has laid for all His creatures in the incarnation and sacrifice of Him Who is Son of God and Son of Man. The world stands, or rather it tries to stand, upon the narrow and selfish foundations which each class and interest tries to lay for itself. As the Church bears witness to the eternal privileges of Mankind in Christ Jesus, the world bears witness to the temporary interests and privileges of classes, and to the narrow interests and privileges of persons. By the world, as opposed to the Church, we may mean any of the hollow and narrow fellowships, or the totality of those fellowships, which men try to build up on the uncatholic or unhuman foundation of class or of self. The world consists of those who (whatever they may say with their lips) do not faithfully trust in God as their reconciled Father in Jesus Christ, and do not regard God as the Father through the Son of Man of "all flesh." "They are of the world," says St. John, "who confess not that Jesus

Christ is come in the flesh." The world consists of those who mould and colour their lives as if they and their set were independent centres and self-owners, and not the children of God and members of His family; who either live as if they had no one to care for them, and were under obligation to take supreme care in every act and thought for themselves and for their class, or else live as if God cared for none but themselves and their sect, or class, or party, and so hate or like other men and women in proportion to their opposition or their affiance to them and their interests. The Church consists of those who are bound to make it the fundamental article of their confession, "I believe in *the* Father." A sectarian says, "I believe in *my* Father." The Church consists of those who are called out to worship the Father "in spirit and in truth;" not merely the Church's Father—for then the Church would be only one more sect in the midst of Humanity—but "*the* Father," because God is the Father both of those who have come home to Him through Jesus Christ, and have taken up their filial position in His organic household, and also of every one of those prodigals whom He is calling home by the gospel of His Son and the outpouring of His Spirit. The world consists of those, whether in the Church or out of it, who deal with other men and women as if they were not their own brethren and sisters in God, but fatherless chattels. The roots of worldliness and of churchliness co-exist in the same person. "We know that

we are of God;" but we know also that we may be of the world. We may be in the Church by vocation, and yet be "of the world" by choice.

II.

In the second part of the text the apostle supplies the Church with a wholesome protection against the misunderstanding of the first part. St. John's saying, "Marvel not if the *world* hate you," differs essentially from the religious world's saying, "Marvel not if the rival *persons whom you call* the world hate you." The old man within us, which is our worldly man and the world's ally, takes pleasure and pride in the notion that we are hated by those whom we choose to call "the world." Probably we do not fix this epithet upon any group of our fellow-men until we find that they do not like us or our cause. The devil will quickly suggest to us that the dislike of men to us or our doctrine, the persecutions with which they follow us, are signs that we are the fellowship which St. John characterizes as those that "have passed from death unto life." But the apostle sees in the dislike of our brethren to us no sign of our passage from death unto life and from ignorance of the Father to knowledge of Him. Like the old religious world we may please not God, and be contrary to all men. St. John declares the witness that our fellowship is with the Father and His Son Jesus Christ, to lie elsewhere. "We know," he says,

"that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren."

The proper questions, therefore, to put to ourselves are few and simple; they are only two. The first is, Who are the brethen? The second is, Do we love the brethren? If we say that the brethren are the Church, we are quite right. But if we say that the brethren are only the Church, we show no faith in the word of Him who is "the Head of the Body, the Church," because He is "the Head of every man." There is no man who ought not to be in the Church. For Jesus says, "If ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father Which is in heaven is perfect." To "pass from death unto life" must be to die to self with Him who died for all men, and to rise again to newness of life with Him who rose again for the justification of all men. We may declaim as convincingly about the emptiness and vanity of "the world" as Massillon did in the presence of the gorgeous court of Louis XIV.; we may realize its hollowness as keenly as some of his courtly hearers did. But we shall no more quit the world than those sick and sated ones quitted it who exchanged the world of the court for the world of the cloister, unless we pass from the self-seeking, which is the central force of the world, to faith in God as Father of every man and to the treatment

of every man as God's child. The catholic and churchly lesson which His French clergy could not or would not fully teach—freedom, brotherhood, citizenship, and manhood for every Huguenot and every serf in France—that at last the Son of Man Himself came to teach in the "blood and fire and vapour of smoke" of the first Revolution.

XXVII.

THE ELEVATION OF THE CROSS.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1873.

GALATIANS v. 24.

"And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts."

TWO of those festivals of the cross which are observed in Christendom are retained in the calendar of the Church of England. One, on the 3rd of May, peculiar to the West, commemorates the legendary finding or "Invention of the Cross" (after its disappearance for three hundred years) by St. Helena, the mother of the Emperor Constantine. The other and older festival, celebrated on this day both in the East and West as the "Elevation of the Cross," still commemorates in the East the legend of Helena, but commemorates in the West the recovery of St. Helena's cross out of the hands of the Persians by the great victory of the Christian Emperor Heraclius, and its restoration to its place in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem.*

* Dr. H. Merz in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, Articles "Kreuzauffindung" and "Kreuzerhebung," Band viii., pp. 61—64.

I.

To-day's festival was apparently known before the victory of Heraclius as the σταυροφανεια (epiphany or appearance of the cross). The Christian thought of the Church dwelt not only on the supposed re-appearance of the material cross in Jerusalem during the pious exploration of St. Helena, but on the appearance of the sign of the cross in the heavens to her imperial son on his way to battle with Maxentius. It was on account of that appearance that the cross was elevated as the standard of the empire. The lowest thing in Roman life was elevated to be the highest—elevated in battles by the Roman armies, and later in the standards of the Christian nations. The cross was thus connected in the Christian mind with two of the greatest battles of history. The victory of the Emperor Constantine had as its issue the conversion of the empire, the baptism of the civilised world. The victory of the Emperor Heraclius rolled back the great Persian invasion which seemed to threaten the Christian Empire and Christian Church with extinction. The Greek Cæsar, the ruler of the civilised world, carried the recovered cross up the hill of Golgotha upon his own shoulders, in order to "elevate" it again to its former place in the restored Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It is impossible for us, who have later history rolled out before us, to appreciate the awful joy with which these two great

triumphs of the sign of the Son of Man and Lord of Hosts were received by the persecuted Church of the fourth century and the terrified Church of the seventh century. They must have recognised in each infinitely more than the exaltation of the material cross. They saw no doubt in each triumph, a new hope and promise for the future of Humanity, held forth to them by that Lord of Hosts Who says in the ancient Holy Gospel of this festival, "I, if I be exalted from the earth, will draw *all men* unto Me." God hid from the contemporary Church the great flood of Arianism which was to follow so immediately upon the exaltation of the cross in the fourth century. He hid the still more mighty power of Mohammedanism which was to follow so immediately upon the exaltation of the cross in the seventh century.

What has the text to do with the day? It is not taken from the old offices, which the Church of England has laid aside, but from the Epistle for the Sunday. The Church of England—God be thanked for the awful singularity — stands apart in Christendom, not only from her sister national Churches which still substitute the Bishop of Rome's voice for the truth, but also from the ancient Churches of the East, in her love for severe and provable truth. She neither regards a vision like that of Constantine, nor a pious persuasion like that of his mother, as a sufficiently firm basis upon which to build up a structure of services to be offered to the God of

Truth. She has not two interpretations of doctrine —one for the ignorant, another for the educated. The worship of the Church is directed to Him Who is the absolute and substantial Reality, Who first revealed His Name to a Nation as "I AM that I AM." The worship of His Church in each Nation is developed along the lines of its beginning in proportion as it is being freed from all that is merely supposition.

The Church of England, however, while rejecting the offices, has retained the name of "Holy Cross Day" in her calendar. Whether the day falls upon a Sunday or a week-day, we may find something in the ordinary offices which will help us to join with the holy Church throughout the world in celebrating the true elevation of the cross. Whatever be the Epistle or Gospel and Lessons for any day, we are sure to find some hint of the cross of Christ in them. To-day, indeed, we find more than a a hint in the Epistle, "They that are Christ's have *crucified* the flesh."

II.

St. Paul describes the Church in this text as "They that are Christ's." He does not indeed tell these Asiatic Greeks that they are to elevate the cross; but he tells them what is far more startling to us with our modern conceptions, that they have elevated the cross. "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts." This, then, let us remember

to-day, is the true elevation of the cross—the crucifixion of the flesh with its affections and lusts. St. Paul, I must repeat, does not here say that the Church of Christ *is to crucify* the flesh. He says what sounds far more strange, that the Church of Christ "*has crucified* the flesh."

What can he mean? Some persons say that it is easy to understand his meaning. The apostle declares, they tell us, that they who are true and genuine Christians, undoubtedly converted men and women, have crucified the flesh. Therefore, they go on to tell us, they who have not crucified the flesh are not Christ's. Who, they must next ask, can dare to say that all baptized persons have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts? How then can we think that all the christened are "they that are Christ's"? How can we think that any except the truly and perfectly converted are Christ's true Church?

The majority of persons who say this are almost certain in time to enrol themselves amongst the truly converted. "The Church" will at last mean with them an aggregation of persons like themselves. Hence, if we join ourselves to them, and ground our hope for ourselves upon the fact of our fellowship with them, we may be unable to enter in fellowship with the apostle who said—not before he was converted, but after he was converted—"I am the chief of sinners." It is better, therefore, to let St. Paul tell us who the persons are who have exalted the cross,

and who "have crucified the flesh." He has no sooner opened his epistle than he begins to show us what sort and condition of persons he means. They are the "Churches of Galatia."* But directly after he has told them that they are Churches, as soon as he has assured them by his apostolical authority that they are indeed and without doubt "they that are Christ's," he tells them that they are "removed from Him that called them into the grace of Christ unto another gospel which is not another."† He calls them "foolish Galatians." He says that they are "bewitched that they should not obey the truth." He accuses them of backsliding from the liberty of faith to the bondage of the ritualism of the law. He says he is afraid of them lest he has bestowed upon them labour in vain.‡ His whole epistle is as fully a charge against them as it is a charge to them. But nevertheless he tells them, though he upbraids them so severely and indignantly, that he has "confidence in them through the Lord."§

These Galatians, whatever wrong they had done or were doing, were "Christ's." That was the fundamental truth of their being. That was the main thing which the apostle saw in them. That was the main feeling of his heart, the main thought of his reason when he was writing to them. That was the fact from which an apostle started when he spoke or wrote to Christians, however low they may have

* i. 2. † i. 6. ‡ iii. 1—3; iv. 9—11. § v. 10.

fallen. "Fallen!" why the word fall implies a height. They were Christ's. They had therefore already "crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts." The great act had been done. Christ had been lifted up in them. The true elevation of the cross had been made in their persons. The apostle could not be more explicit than he is: "For ye are all," says he, "the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus: for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."* His voice thus reaches to us in England, and in this distant time. We have been baptized into Christ; we have put on Christ. We are Christ's. It must follow therefore that we have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts. The true elevation of the cross has been once for all made in our persons.

III.

You see in what direction we must turn our thought if we would understand this text. St. Paul sent every Galatian back to his baptism (as the Catechism sends each of us back), that each may there learn the whole truth about himself, his state of salvation, and his duties to God and mankind. Every other fact in our life may deceive us, may be misunderstood, misinterpreted. But that one fact in each man's life abides everlastingly true. There is no lie there, no poor and paltry half-truth, no mere supposition, nor guess, nor opinion. There we learn what we men "and women"

* iii. 26—29.

and children are in ourselves; but there too we learn what we men and women and children are in Christ Jesus, our Adam. There we learn how it is that so much which is vile and damnable and hateful shows itself within us every day of our lives, so many affections and lusts that need to be crucified and killed. There we learn how it is that we have any desire to be pure and good; how it is that we find within us a divine and mighty cross to which we *can* nail the flesh with its affections and lusts. Our baptism was no mere stamping of a cross upon our foreheads; it was the elevation of the cross in us, body, soul, and spirit. It was the lifting up of the cross of God's Son in the lives of us sons and daughters of men. We became Christ's men, as every human creature is bound to be by Christ's redemption: we declared that we would not be Adam's men, slaves of the flesh with its affections and lusts. God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ elevated the cross of His Son in us, and took us for His sons and daughters; we, by our sponsors if we were babes, by ourselves if we were adults, crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts to the cross of God's Son. Each of us has been asked, "Dost thou renounce the carnal desires of the flesh so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them?" Each of us has answered, "I renounce them all."

The Son of God foretold that the baptism of nations and men would be the result of His elevation upon the cross. "I, if I be elevated, will draw all men

unto Me." The baptism of a nation is the elevation of the cross in that nation; the baptism of a man is the elevation of the cross in that man. A Christian nation has a new starting-point as a nation; it follows a new banner, it has the right starting-point, the only right banner for "all nations." A Christian man has a new starting-point as a man. He has acknowledged the revelation of the true Manhood in Jesus Christ. He has come into the position to which Christ calls "every creature." Attribute as much as you will to civilisation, and as much as you will to race, you have still to account for the fact that civilisation, or the development of the Humanity in men and in nations, either stands still or else dies out wherever the cross of the Man has not been elevated; or if it is re-introduced, as it now is in the East and in Africa, it is re-introduced by the nations in which the cross has been elevated.

But let us come back with the apostle to persons. The Lord of Hosts Who triumphed over all the terrible foes of our race and of each soul by His cross, Who in His providential ruling of the nations gave Constantine and Heraclius victory over the heathen, has elevated the cross in the life of every one who hears me. In the truest moment of your life did you not confess that the Son of God and we children of men have one common cause? Did you not acknowledge that God's foes are man's foes? Did you not take up God's battle as man's battle? Did you not attest that His cross is the banner under which you

must fight if you are to be true men and women? Did you not avow that the very calling and business of every son and daughter of man in this earth is to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto life's end? You and I, my brethren, promised by our baptism to fight under Christ and by the side of Christ against the foes which He is fighting. We made this promise in spite of "the flesh," the most insidious of all Christ's enemies, which has tempted us from our very cradle, and will go on tempting us until our death-bed, to ally ourselves with the world and with the devil, and to fight against God and deny the obligation of His Son's cross. This promise of our baptism was our crucifixion of the flesh with the affections and lusts. Christ's apostle, therefore, does not only tell us that the cross of Christ has been elevated in us because we have been declared to be new-born brothers and sisters of the Crucified, have been signed and sealed as the sons and daughters of His Father: he further tells that we ourselves "have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts" because we have made this promise. Therefore we who by our baptism "are Christ's" may speak of the crucifixion of the flesh with the affections and lusts, as St. Paul plainly does, as an accomplished historical and biographical fact. The flesh is no more man's right lord and master than the devil is, or than the world is. We have declared the flesh to be a usurper, a pretender, and not mankind's true lord. We have at our baptism

or christening renounced our inherent tyrant and usurper as fully as we have renounced the spiritual liar and tyrant, or as we have renounced the tyrannical claims which external society and party make upon our obedience. We are as much traitors to our true Leader when we follow the "affections and lusts" of the flesh, as we should be if we worshipped the devil instead of the Father, or chose to live a diabolical life rather than a human life.

The effects of God's elevation of the cross of His Son in us, the effects of our crucifixion of the flesh with its passions and lusts to that cross, still continue in us; they shew themselves every day in our lives. St. Paul had already spoken, in an earlier part of the Epistle, of these effects of that crucifixion as a strange phenomenon in a man's life before he spoke of the crucifixion itself. "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." * What is the cause of this inward contrariety? God as our Father has elevated the cross of His Son in us, the sign of our sonship to Him, and that cross is the irreconcilable foe of the flesh with its affections and lusts. Wherever the cross of Christ and the flesh of Adam are, there fighting must be. Our business is to treat the flesh along with the passions and lusts as crucified to Christ's cross; to look up to His cross as His pledge that the flesh

* v. 17.

is not our lord, and to use His cross as the instrument for delivering us from the power of these passions and lusts. When we feel the pressure of wicked lusts and evil passions, we may tremble and quail at the battle that lies before us; but when we look up to the cross of the Divine Sonship which Christ's Father and our Father has elevated in our lives, we see the standard of war, the true *vexillum Regis*, we recognise that Christian fighting is the life-long and the only condition of Christian living. "When I was a monk," says that great doctor by whose hands the Father so marvellously re-elevated His Son's cross in the consciousness of Christendom, "I thought by-and-by that I was utterly cast away, if at any time I felt the lust of the flesh, if I felt any evil emotion. If at that time I had rightly understood those sentences of St. Paul, I should not have so wretchedly tormented myself, but should have thought and said to myself as I commonly now do, 'Martin, thou shalt not utterly be without sin, for thou hast flesh: thou shalt therefore feel the battle thereof. Despair not, therefore, but resist it strongly.'"*

The words of the apostle are indeed words of

* This Festival was observed by Luther. He has left a sermon for the day, in which he urges the Christian folk to an evangelical Elevation of the Cross:—"Nicht wie der Kaiser Heraklius oder die Stationirer, die mit Kresem und anderm Narrenwerk umgehen; sondern so, dass wir erkennen, wie es Gott aus gnädigem Willen aufgelegt, also dass wir ihm danken darum, es gross achten und fröhlich seyen darob, heimlich in Herzen vor Gott; und dass wir ferner Christo unser Kreuz nach tragen." —*Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. Erlangen, XV., pp. 336, &c.

history: they send us back to the past—back to our baptism as God's elevation of His cross in us, and as our "crucifixion of the flesh." But to understand them as a part of history we must be using them every day as words of divine and apostolical precept. They who are Christ's, and we are Christ's, must, he says, "walk in the Spirit." Thus alone can we keep "the flesh with the affections and lusts" in the state of crucifixion;—"knowing this," as the same apostle writes to the Church of Rome, "that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."

XXVIII.

SCIENCE AND THEOLOGY.

NOVEMBER 17, 1872.

ST. JOHN X. 30—33.

"I and my Father are one. Then the Jews took up stones again to stone Him. Jesus answered them, Many good works have I showed you from My Father; for which of those works do ye stone Me? The Jews answered Him, saying, For a good work we stone Thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God."

THERE is a tendency in our age to glorify religion, either as pious sensation or as activity in good works, at the expense of theology. Religion, it is said, is universal and everlasting: Theology is limited and temporary. The Person whom the religious Jews tried to stone to death for blasphemy eighteen centuries ago is declared, like Buddha, Mohammed, and Comte, to have founded a religion. It is acknowledged by the majority of the rejectors of the historical and living theology of the Church, that the "religion" of Jesus of Nazareth is not only better than any religion which preceded His, but seems to be, so far as present lights go, about as perfect as

religion can ever be. Some scrupulous persons may feel compelled to ask, "Are we still Christians?" but the many are content to accept the word Christian as the permanent synonym for a really religious man.

Jesus Christ is not to the religionist the express Image of the Invisible God: nor is He the one bond of union between God and man, between mankind's past and future: nor is He the Revealer of Himself sent to us by the Unseen God that we may know for certain that He is the Father: nor is He the present King over all in heaven and earth and throughout the universe. To the religionist He is simply somewhat the same in the moral and spiritual sphere as Copernicus and Newton are in the physical sphere—the greatest of discoverers. He has, like them, made once for all discoveries which no subsequent discoveries can annul: He has received in His sphere, as they have received in their spheres, revelations which are perfect and complete. We are told that the catholic or Christian Theology, which says that He came down from God and revealed God's nature, will, and relation to men, will perish. We are told, on the contrary, that the Christian Religion, so much of Jesus of Nazareth's discoveries of the will of God as can be known and put into practical use by men, will probably endure as long as the world endures.

Such controversialists are like the Jews in the Gospel. They listen patiently to Jesus Christ and to

the Church so long as His speech in His person or by His Church is only of religion. They admire His sermon on the mount, admire the greater part of His parables, they accept the testimony of His disciple that "pure and undefiled religion before God, even (whether or not God be) the Father, is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted." Like the Jews, they do not think of casting stones at Jesus or His Church "for good works." But when He utters theology, when He says, "I and my Father are one," when, being a man, He declares Himself to be, in a sense which the religionists think blasphemy, one with God, when the Church proclaims the Son of Man to be "very God of very God, begotten not made, by Whom all things were made," then like their Jewish predecessors they take up stones to cast at Him and at her—such stones as the effected work of Christ's Spirit upon the thoughts of men and the laws of nations now permit to be cast at those who are accused of speaking blasphemy.

The champions of religion against theology in our time have found powerful allies, and are likely long to find them, in the modern discoverers and interpreters of nature.* I am quite conscious that it ought not to be so. Theology is the science or knowledge of

* The first successful preacher of the distinction in the English tongue, if I remember rightly, was Theodore Parker; at least he was the first, some twenty years ago, to bring the distinction before me. It has been adopted with slavish and uninquiring assent, in strange contrast to the free and sceptical inquiry with which they approach subjects within their domain, by the most popular scientific teachers, and the anonymous pontiffs of the

God. There can be no theology unless God can be known. The Church has no other business than to declare that He has made Himself known to Humanity in His Son, that He is making Himself known to every creature by His Spirit, Who is compelling each within to feel after Him as the Father, and to put questions to the Son of Man and to those who profess to represent Him. The discovery and interpretation of nature is the science of the works and laws of the same God. History, geology, astronomy, and the like, give to the patient inquirer a knowledge of the effected and effecting will of God in His animate and inanimate universe.

But have not we set the example of confounding religion with that theology which is the basis of perfect religion? It seems to me that we who are theologians by divine calling—we whom the Church entitled (when titles and degrees were more of realities) divines or doctors of divinity—have provoked the discoverers of God's word and work in nature, even through their most religious instincts, to go to war against us. In thousands of distressing books and lectures Christian priests and teachers have attempted to twist every fresh discovery of God's own constitution of the universe into harmony with the

newspapers. Professor Huxley says, speaking of the miserable School-Board contests (*Contemporary Review*, Dec., 1870), "What the 'religious party' is crying for is mere theology, under the name of religion; while the 'secularists' have unwisely and wrongfully admitted the assumption of their opponents and demanded the abolition of all 'religious' teaching, when they only want to be free of theology."

pre-scientific theories of its constitution which they supposed, rightly or wrongly, to have been declared once for all by the liberator of the Hebrew nation. Nay, they have been ready to fight against God by contending that physical facts were false which the truth was plainly shewing them to be true.

Our idolatry of the words of the Bible, the book which we have long been told "*is the religion* of Protestants," has led us to suppose that the faith of nations and men in the ever-living Word of God (whom we are bound to preach as disclosed in Jesus Christ) is depending upon the scientific accuracy of the words of Moses. When God has discovered to religious and pious questioners of His universe—that is, to those who are intent only upon seeing what and how He has really made it, what He is saying by this or that fact—the wonderful antiquity of our own earth, we have trembled lest God's revelation of undoubted and undeniable physical truths should abolish human faith in Him who tells men that He is Himself the Truth. We have led men to suppose that our faith in the eternal Word of God, the Centre and Revealer of theology, hung quivering and dependent upon our assent to the scientific accuracy of every phrase used by Moses, Joshua, and David. We have not so much requested of the explorers of God's universe that they should tell us what they have discovered in it, should tell us the truth, should tell us what God has shewn them, as we have demanded that they

should tell us nothing which we cannot at once harmonize with the statements and beliefs of the inspired Hebrew writers. Men of science may not unjustly accuse us of asking them not to be religious, not to tell what they believe to be the truth, but to be so irreligious as to tell us only whatever we wish to be true. But a really religious man must love truth above everything. It must be his desire to be freed from every notion which is false or only half true. Many a natural inquirer may indeed start with a theology or anti-theology which colours all he sees. But if God discovers to us more and more of the real constitution of the earth and of living creatures by the truth-loving and lie-hating and guess-rejecting labours of men of science, we shall be irreligious if we try to disbelieve the truth, whatever the consequence of believing the truth may be. If we take our stand upon Theology—that is, upon the catholic faith, the Gospel, the Creed—we need have no fear of the consequences of asking what is true or of believing what is proved to be true. The discoveries of science, especially in the provinces of geology and palæontology, may be death to the "mere religion of the Bible," the religion which has its only foundation in the words of Holy Scripture. But the sure position of the Church of God is unassailable by any discoveries of science. The rock upon which the Church is built is neither a pope nor a book, but the union of God and Mankind in Him Who says in the text, "I and my Father are one." It is our business to

announce the Theology which is the *foundation* of pure Religion—the union of the Creator with the creature in the person of Jesus Christ, the communion of the Creator with the creature in the person of the Holy Spirit.

I hope no one will mistake my meaning. How in the presence of the Church of God can I exaggerate the preciousness of the Bible? There is nothing in the world more sacred and divine than the Bible, except the Church herself, by whose foregoers the holy prophets, and by whose children the apostles and evangelists, the Bible was gradually made. In what misery would the Church be if she did not possess the Bible! Imagine the bride of Jesus without the Gospels, without a single written record to tell her what kind of life the Everlasting Son lived on earth, what words He spake here, what deeds He did here! What confusions have crept into our theology; how untheological the Church's teachers have become—how they have sunk into mere teachers of religion when the Bible has ceased to be the daily study of the Church! But we must at the same time recollect that if no single book of the Bible had been written, the Church would still be in existence. "Jesus lives!" He lives, not because St. Matthew and St. John or other writers of the Bible tell us so, but because He lives they have told us what His life on earth was. They have told us by His careful providence so many of the deeds He did in their sight, so many of the words He said in

their hearing, that we may not be left to form our own conceptions of the invisible Redeemer and Head of our race, but may know exactly what He is. The Church not only existed before the history of her foundation was written, but the Church was proclaiming up and down the world the theology revealed to her by Jesus Christ before St. Matthew wrote down Jesus Christ's command to us to go and teach all nations that He is the Son of God. If the apostles had not preached "the rock" of *theology* to the nations as the foundation of Christendom, if they had substituted a sandy and watery *religion* for it, it is possible that science in its present development could not have been attained. The Church was blessing men in the name which Jesus Christ had revealed as the name of God, and loosing men from their sins in the name of God, before the evangelists wrote down by the inspiration of the Spirit of God their recollections and traditions of the institution of the universal ministry. The Church had been celebrating the eucharist for years before the evangelists had put down their written record of the Lord's institution of it.

When men compare the Bible with the Koran or other religious books, when they class the Bible and such books together as different species of "written revelation," they are on a false path. We do not honour Holy Writ by comparing it with such books, even although we succeed in showing its marvellous superiority over what we think its rivals.

The Bible sends us away from itself to a Person Who is the ever-living Word of God. He is not in its pages, but is at the right hand of God. He is not only at the right hand of God Whom He has first revealed by His Sonship as the Father, but is now enlightening every man who comes into the world. He is at this instant as near to every one of us as we are to ourselves. He is not only speaking to each conscience and demanding its obedience as its actual Lord, but He is now offering His body and blood to us through His creatures of bread and wine. The prophets and founders of all religions are dead; they have left us nothing but their words. Many of them are indeed noble and wonderful words. The memory of them comes to us through books and in legends. But Jesus lives! He never pretended to be the founder of a new Religion. He declared Himself to be the Centre of Theology. He has not left us His mere memory: He gives us His presence. He makes as strong claims upon you and me, upon every man of science and upon every untaught peasant, at this instant, as He made upon Moses in Egypt, upon Peter in Galilee, upon Saul on the Damascus road, upon John in Patmos, upon Augustine in Africa, upon Luther before the great Cæsar at Worms, upon Latimer in the fire. He does not entreat us from the dead pages of a book to be loyal to the principles of the religion He therein lays down. He commands us at this hour in our consciences to be loyal to Him as our living King. The Living and Eternal Word

of God Himself wrote no book. Jesus had no need (like the founders of religions, the Mohammeds and Comtes) to write a book, because, as the Eternal Word, He is directly and every instant speaking to every one whom He claims for His disciple.

I had the privilege during this past week of listening to solemn counsels upon "The Relations of Science to Religion," addressed to the clergy of London by one of the most eminent interpreters of nature in our time and nation.* It has been said of him that "from the sponge to man he has thrown light upon every subject he has touched." I know no greater privilege for a priest, no more instructive and suggestive occupation, than the listening to one whose whole life is spent in nothing else but the pure attempt to get nearer to perfect and undeniable truth; whose whole business and end it is to go through and through that which merely *seems* until he comes into actual contact with that which *is*—with some real work and word and thought of God, though it be in the lowest grade of God's order. In a world crowded with millions bent mainly on making money, or on earning comfort in this world or some other, what an awful relief it is to come here and there upon a man whose whole energy is bent toward nothing else but the knowing of the truth. The ever-living Centre of theology, the Personal Word of the Father, has promised us that the truth shall make us free. He claims to be the abso-

* Professor Owen at Sion College.

lute and the universal Truth. He is therefore the only absolute and perfect Liberator by the knowledge of Whom anyone soever can be made free. But we cannot know the least measure of truth in any sphere of His Father's universe without some comparative liberation from some bondage by that knowledge. All self-suppression of that eagerness to know what is true, which He Who is the Man and the Truth has by His relation to Humanity quickened in our race, is not merely irreligious, as men of science declare, but it is the work of theologians to declare that it is also ungodly. If the catholic theology be true, it cannot be Jesus the Truth Who urges us to suppress and arrest the intellectual movement toward fact and reality. All our hatred of lying and falseness, all our impatience with unproved conjecture and guessing, all our determination to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is true," must come (if the catholic theology be the science of God) from Jesus Christ. All contrary counsels from without us, all contrary inclinations within us, must be as untheological as they are irreligious. Such counsel comes always from the liar and the father of lies; such inclinations come from the flesh.

I confess that the true men of science in our age, so long as they confine themselves to their domain, are setting me and the whole order in the Church of which I am a member a noble example of religious devotion to the truth. But when they leave their own sphere and enter upon ours, we have not only a

right but a call to defend ourselves; because they do not really attack our persons or our moral character, but the office and function to which the Supreme Truth Jesus Christ has called us, for the culture and liberation of the nations and of every creature. The anatomist and palæontologist who has extended so immensely the range of human knowledge, and opened such interminable paths to future explorers, seems to urge us to regard ourselves as teachers of religion, and not as stewards of God's mysteries. He has reminded us how theologians by profession have persecuted, imprisoned, and murdered men who first maintained as true what now all confess to be true. He goes on to say for science, that "it has not destroyed Religion, but has clipped the claws of Theology." He, indeed, has never lost his personal reverence toward God in his search for the real constitution of God's works. Is it not because what he would call his religion, what the Church would rather call his theology, has not hung upon the words of the Bible only, but upon that Person to Whom the Bible sends him and sends all? Therefore, when he has been compelled to give up, one after another, his own private judgments and inherited judgments upon the age of this earth, on the manner or duration of the earth's genesis, on the first appearance of death in the world, on the Noachian deluge, and the like, he has not had to give up what he may call his religion, but what is really his and our theology. The Church can hardly make it cause

of complaint that the most protesting of Protestants find at last that all which is most enduring and precious in what they call their religion does not depend and cannot depend for its life and authority upon "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," but that it must perish unless it has a profounder and more substantial basis. The writers of the Bible themselves are witnesses to the fact that religion needs for its support faith in a self-revealing *One*, that religion lives upon theology. Did not the Psalmist know that the heavens would still have declared the glory of God and the firmament would have shewn His handiwork, although there had been no Psalmist to write down his religious perception of their declaration? All the works of God would have still praised Him, although God had inspired no writer to record his perception of the creation's praise of the Creator. The early writers of the Bible do not bear witness to the Bible, but to a Living Word of God which has spoken every creature into being, and to a Spirit of God which is the Life-giver and Life-sustainer of the universe. The later writers of the Bible declare that this Word was the Co-eternal Son of the Father, in Whose image our race was created, and Who has given it new development by shewing Himself to us as the Son of Man; and that this Spirit is directly bringing "all flesh" into communion with the Father and the Son, and is convincing the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.

I can only close a subject opening up to us so wide a range of thinking by connecting it again with the text. The witness of our Blessed Lord to the Father as revealed in Himself as the Son, and the consequent action of the religious Jews, bring out in sharp distinctness the relation between religion and theology. Had Jesus Christ taught a religion only, had he not revealed that Name, Threefold and One, which is the source and life of all true religion, the Jews would not then have stoned Him, neither would they later have crucified Him. Even an atheist has no objection to religion, as religion is defined by St. James. The latest religion, the invention of the intensely religious Frenchman, declares that it has no god except Humanity. But as the positivist Humanity includes no "head of every man" as its author and its perfecter, unless M. Comte was such a head, we cannot be sure that it is a Humanity at all. It may be nothing but the sum-total of individual men and women. The Son of God offended the Jews, and was at last offered up upon the cross for the sins of the whole world, not because He taught a religion, or the best of religions, or even the absolute religion, but because he bore witness to that theology of which He boldly proclaimed Himself to be the centre, which we believe He has commissioned us to preach to nations and to men as the only possible basis of perfect religion. It is not from St. John "the divine" alone, but from every one of the evangelists, that we learn that Jesus Christ was put to death

not for His religion, but for His theology. This, too, was the teaching which the Apostle of the Nations delivered to his disciple, that he might "commit the same to faithful men" concerning "Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession." "Hereafter shall the Son of Man sit on the right hand of the power of God. Then said they all, Art thou then the Son of God? And He said unto them, Ye say that I am."* "Then the High Priest"—the cultured, sceptical, and religious Sadducee—"rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy."† "Ye have heard the blasphemy. What think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death."‡ What else but His supreme confession of the Theology upon which His Church is standing, was the "good confession" which St. Paul believed Jesus Christ had made before Pontius Pilate? When Pilate said, "I find no fault in Him, the Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God."

* St. Luke xxii. 69—70. † St. Matthew xxvi. 65.
‡ St. Mark xiv. 64.

THE END.

VIRTUE AND CO., PRINTERS, CITY ROAD, LONDON.

Works by Henry Alford, D.D.

THE LATE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

The Book of Genesis and Part of the Book of Exodus. A Revised Version, with Marginal References, and an Explanatory Commentary. Demy 8vo, 12s.

The New Testament.
Authorised Version Revised. 6s., 3s. 6d., 1s. 6d.

Essays and Addresses,
Chiefly on Church Subjects. Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Family Prayers
For the Christian Year. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.; 12mo, 1s. 6d.

The Week of Prayer.
For Use in Schools. Neat cloth, 9d.

The Year of Praise:
Being Hymns with Tunes, for the Sundays and Holidays of the Year. 3s. 6d., 1s. 6d., 1s., 6d.

How to Study the New Testament.
In Three Parts. Small 8vo, 3s. 6d. each.

Eastertide Sermons,
Preached before the University of Cambridge. Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Meditations:
Advent, Creation, Providence. Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Fireside Homilies.
Small 8vo, 2s. 6d.

DALDY, ISBISTER, & CO., 56, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

Works by C. J. Vaughan, D.D.

MASTER OF THE TEMPLE.

Family Prayers.
Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

The Presence of God in His Temple.
Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Sundays in the Temple.
Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Half-hours in the Temple Church.
Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Last Words in the Parish Church of Doncaster.
Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Earnest Words for Earnest Men.
Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Plain Words on Christian Living.
Small 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Christ the Light of the World.
Small 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Characteristics of Christ's Teaching.
Small 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Voices of the Prophets on Faith, Prayer, and Human Life. Small 8vo, 2s. 6d.

DALDY, ISBISTER, & CO., 56, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.